

The Gazette



of

India

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

No. 44] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1959/KARTIKA 9, 1881

NOTICE

The undermentioned Gazettes of India Extraordinary were published upto the 20th October, 1959 :—

Issue No.	No. and date	Issued by	Subject
150-A	S.Os. 2307-A, 2307-B and 2307-C dated 15th October, 1959.	Ministry of Information and Broad-casting.	Approval of films specified therein.
151-A	S.O. 2308-A, dated 19th October, 1959.	Ministry of Home Affairs.	The President nominates Shri Jairamdas Daulatram to the Council of States in place of Dr. P. V. Kane.
152.	S.O. 2309, dated 20th October, 1959.	Ministry of Commerce and Industry.	Details regarding sale or purchase of Camphor.
153.	S.Os. 2359 and 2360, dated 20th October, 1959.	Ministry of Information and Broadcasting.	Approval of films specified therein.

Copies of the Gazettes Extraordinary mentioned above will be supplied on indent to the Manager of Publications, Civil Lines, Delhi. Indents should be submitted so as to reach the Manager within ten days of the date of issue of this Gazette.

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than the Ministry of Defence) and by Central Authorities (other than the Administrations of Union Territories).

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Economic Affairs)

(Office of the Controller of Capital Issues)

New Delhi, the 23rd October 1959

S.O. 2363.—For Rule 4 of the Capital Issue (Application for Consent) Rules, 1954, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3 dated the 13th March, 1954 as S. R. O. 828 dated the 8th March, 1954 and subsequently amended by S. R. O. 2448 published in the Gazette of India dated the 27th October, 1956, the following shall be substituted, namely—

- “4. Every application under these rules shall be accompanied by a treasury receipt for Rs. 50 which shall, at Bombay, Calcutta, Delhi, Madras and Bangalore, be deposited in the Reserve Bank of India

and at other places in the nearest Government Treasury or in the nearest Branch or an agency of the Reserve Bank. The amount shall be credited to the head 'XLVI—Miscellaneous—Miscellaneous— Receipts towards issue of Capital under the Capital Issues (Control) Act, 1947'.

[No. F. 2(18)-CCI/59-4048.]

A. BAKSI, Controller of Capital Issues.

(Department of Economic Affairs)

New Delhi, the 22nd October, 1959

S.O. 2364—Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, as on the 16th October 1959.

BANKING DEPARTMENT

Liabilities	Rs.	Assets	Rs.
Capital paid up	5,00,00,000	Notes	16,60,15,000
Reserve Fund	80,00,00,000	Rupee Coin	2,25,000
National Agricultural Credit (Long-term Operations) Fund	30,00,00,000	Subsidiary Coin	9,08,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	4,00,00,000	Bills Purchased and Discounted:	
Deposits:		(a) Internal
(a) Government		(b) External
(1) Central Government	53,01,03,000	(c) Government Treasury Bills	43,83,93,000
(2) Other Governments	29,93,06,000	Balances held abroad*	22,17,07,000
(b) Banks	80,59,81,000	Loans and Advances to Governments	18,24,31,000
(c) Others	118,68,53,000	Other Loans and Advances†	80,87,08,000
Bills Payable	18,81,41,000	Investments	246,72,02,000
Other Liabilities	18,02,30,000	Other Assets	9,90,25,000
Rupees	438,46,14,000	Rupees	438,46,14,000

*Includes Cash & Short term Securities

†The item 'Other Loans and Advances' includes Rs. 1,00,000 - advanced to scheduled banks against usance bills under Section 17(4)(c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

Dated the 21st day of October, 1959.

An Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, for the week ended the 16th day of October 1959.

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

Liabilities	Rs.	Rs.	Assets	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department	16,60,15,000		A. Gold Coin and Bullion:		
Notes in circulation	16,81,05,81,000		(a) Held in India	117,76,03,000	
Total Notes issued		16,97,65,96,000	(b) Held outside India	
			Foreign Securities	163,00,89,000	
			TOTAL OF A		280,76,92,000
			B. Rupee Coin		135,37,97,000
			Government of India Rupee Securities		12,81,51,07,000.
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper
TOTAL LIABILITIES		16,97,65,96,000	TOTAL ASSETS		16,97,65,96 000

Dated the 21st day of October 1959.

H. V. R. IENGAR,
Governor.

[No. F. 3(2) BC/59.]
A. BAKSI, Jt. Secy.

ERRATUM

The S.O. No. of the Statement of Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India as on 9th October, 1959, published in the Gazette of India, Part II—Section 3(ii), dated 24th October, 1959, on page 2961, which has been omitted erroneously, may be read as S.O. 2320.

CENTRAL BOARD OF REVENUE

INCOME-TAX

New Delhi, the 15th October 1959

S.O. 2365.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (6) of Section 5 of the Indian Income-tax Act, 1922 (11 of 1922), the Central Board of Revenue hereby makes the following further amendments in the Schedule annexed to its notification S.R.O. 1214 No. 44-Income-tax dated the 1st July, 1952:—

In the said Schedule, for the existing entries in Column 5, substitute the following, namely:—

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. <i>Against S. Nos. 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 15-A, 15-5 and 78(C).</i> | Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax 'C' Range, Bombay. |
| 2. <i>Against S. Nos. 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 20-A, 20-B, 21, 21-A, 21-B, 21-C, 21-D, 21-E & 21-F.</i> | Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax 'D' Range Bombay. |

[No. 109(F. No. 55/189/59-IT.)]

New Delhi, the 19th October 1959

S.O. 2366.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 5 of the Indian Income-tax Act, 1922 (11 of 1922) the Central Board of Revenue hereby makes the following further amendments in the Schedule appended to its notification S.O. 660 No. 35-Income-tax dated the 22nd April, 1959, namely:—

In the said Schedule under the sub-head "VIII-Delhi and Rajasthan" against Udaipur Range, after the existing entry "4, Multipurpose Project Circle, Rajasthan, Ajmer. (In respect of persons who have their principal place of business in or reside in the jurisdiction of income-tax Wards specified in entries 1 to 2)" the following shall be added, namely:—

"5. Income-tax Office, Bhilwara".

This notification shall be deemed to have taken effect from the 15th October 1959.

Explanatory Note

NOTE.—The amendment has become necessary due to the creation of new Income-tax Circle in the charge of the Commissioner of Income-tax, Delhi and Rajasthan, New Delhi.

(The above note does not form a part of the notification but is intended to be merely clarificatory).

[No. 111(F. No. 50/25/59-IT.)]

CORRIGENDUM

INCOME-TAX

New Delhi, the 16th October 1959

S.O. 2367.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 5 of the Indian Income-tax Act, 1922 (11 of 1922) the Central Board of Revenue hereby directs that in their notification No. 107 Income-tax dated the 29th September 1959 published as SO 2189 on page 2680 of Part II Section 3(ii) of the Gazette of India of the 10th October 1959 for the word "Eludu" appearing against (a) the following word shall be substituted, namely:—

"Eluru".

[No. 110 (F. No. 50/18/59-IT)]

D. V. JUNNARKAR, Under Secy.

CENTRAL EXCISE COLLECTORATE, BOMBAY*Bombay, the 26th September 1959*

SUBJECT.—Central Excise Rules 1944—Delegation of power under Rule 189 to the A.C. (R).

S.O. 2368.—In pursuance of Rule 5 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944 I hereby authorise the Assistant Collector Central Excise (Refunds) Bombay to exercise my power under Rule 189 of the Central Excise Rules 44.

[No. CER/5/T/5/59.]

CENTRAL EXCISE*Bombay, the 12th October 1959*

S.O. 2369.—In exercise of the powers under Rule 5 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944, I empower the Assistant Collector of Central Excise to exercise the powers of the Collector under Rule mentioned in Column No. I of the sub-joined table within their respective jurisdictions subject to the limitations prescribed in Column No. II thereof:—

Central Excise Rules Column I	Limitations Column II
189 and 196	The powers to sanction remission of duty on excisable goods lost by natural causes or accident provided the duty involved on such goods does not exceed Rs. 500/- (Five hundred only).

[No. CER/5/2(MP)/59.]

S.O. 2370.—In exercise of the power conferred by Rule 5 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944, I empower the Assistant Collectors of Central Excise in the Bombay Central Excise Collectorate, to exercise within their respective jurisdictions the powers of the Collector conferred by the provisions of the rules enumerated in Column I of the table subject to the limitations set out in Column II thereof:—

TABLE

Rules I	Limitations II
14-A, 27(4) and 147	<p>(i) In respect of rule 14-A the powers of remission of duty in case of loss of goods over-board provided the duty involved in each individual case is not more than Rs. 250/-.</p> <p>(ii) In respect of rules 27(4) and 147, powers of remission of duty in the cases of loss or destruction by unavoidable accident of goods lodged in private bonded storerooms or warehouses provided the duty involved in each individual case is not more than 250/-</p>

[No. CER/5/T/659.]

T. C. SETH, Collector.

THE MYSORE CENTRAL EXCISE COLLECTORATE**CENTRAL EXCISE***Bangalore, the 9th October 1959*

S.O. 2371.—In exercise of the powers conferred on me under Rule 233 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944, I direct that all licensed manufacturers of Rayon

or Art Silk and Cotton fabrics on powerlooms who pay duty under the compounded levy system and who are in the jurisdiction of the "Mysore Central Excise Collectorate" shall point in serial order the distinct number on each loom installed in their factory, whether employed in the manufacture of any excisable fabrics or not and shall maintain a disposition chart for each such premise, in the enclosed form 'A'.

2. Entries in the loom disposition chart in form 'A' should be made immediately on commencement of a shift and within (30) thirty minutes of starting of any loom on any variety of fabrics. The entries should be made in ink.

3. The following abbreviations shall be adopted for indicating in the loom disposition chart the varieties of fabrics manufactured:

1. Rayon or Art Silk fabrics—'AS'
2. Cotton fabrics—'CF'
3. Exempted fabrics—'X'
4. Non-Excisable fabrics—'NE'
5. Idle looms—'I'

4. Where manufacturers produce both Art Silk and Cotton fabrics, it is not necessary to maintain separate looms disposition charts for both the commodities.

5. At the end of each shift the total No. of looms employed for each variety of fabrics and the No. of looms which remained idle shall be clearly indicated in the loom disposition chart.

6. The charts shall be kept in the weaving shed and shall be made available as and when demanded by any officer of this Department.

7. Manufacturers who already maintain accounts furnishing information similar to those required in the loom disposition chart should apply to the Superintendent in whose jurisdiction their factory is located for exemption form maintaining the loom disposition chart.

[Issued from file C. VI(P) (21) 35/59-B. 1.]

FORM A.

POWER LOOMS DISPOSITION CHART

MONTH

Name of the Manufacturer..... L. No..... Premises No.....

Sl. No. of Looms	No. of shift	Dates				(upto the end of month (including Sundays and holidays)
		1	2	3	4	
1.	1st					
	2nd					
	3rd					
2.	1st					
	2nd					
	3rd					
TOTAL						
*1. A.S.F.	1st Shift					
	2nd Shift					
	3rd Shift					
2. C.F.	1st Shift					
	2nd Shift					
	3rd Shift					
3. X	1st Shift					
	2nd Shift					
	3rd Shift					
4. N.E.	1st Shift					
	2nd Shift					
	3rd Shift					
5. Idk	1st Shift					
	2nd Shift					
	3rd Shift					

*NOTE. Expansion of abbreviations :
 A.S.F. = Art Silk Fabrics.
 C.F. = Cotton Fabrics.
 X = Exempted fabrics.
 N.E. = Non-excisable Fabrics.

[No. 10/59.]

A. R. SHANMUGAM, Collector.

CENTRAL EXCISE COLLECTORATE, DELHI**CENTRAL EXCISE**

New Delhi, the 13th October 1959

SUBJECT:—*Vegetable Non-essential Oils—Raw materials used production of—
Verification of—Recording of consumption of electricity or power.*

S.O. 2372.—In exercise of the powers conferred upon me under Rule 233 of the Central Excise, Rules, 1944, I hereby require the manufacturers of Vegetable Non-essential Oils, working under the simplified procedure, to maintain the following:—

- (i) An electricity/Diesel Oil Consumption Register as set out in Annexure A and B to this Notification. Entries in the Register shall be made by the manufacturers on each occasion before starting and closing the operations.
- (ii) Raw Material Register in the form given in annexure 'C' Entries in respect of each transaction shall be entered in the Register.

ANNEXURE "A"

Electricity Consumption Register.

(To be maintained by manufacturers of Vegetable non-essential Oils working under the simplified procedure)

Name of factory
Licence No.

- (1) No. of Meters installed with full particulars.
-
- (2) Purposes for which electricity consumed.

Date	Commenced		Stopped		For crushing of seeds		For other purposes	Signature of factory Manager	Remarks (Insert total No. of units consumed during each day)
	Time	Metre Reading	Time	Metre Reading	Units consumed	Quantity of seeds crushed	Unit consumed		
1		2	3		4		5	6	7

ANNEXURE "B"

Diesel or Fuel Oil Consumption Register.

(To be Maintained by manufacturers of Vegetable non-essential oil working under the simplified procedure).

Name of Factory
Licence No.

- (1) Kind of soils used for running the Mill.
- (2) Purposes for which energy consumed.

[illegible]

ANNEXURE 'C'

Name of Factory

Licence No.

Account of Raw Material and Oil extracted

(To be maintained by manufacturers of Vegetable non-essential Oils working under the simplified procedure).

Date	Opening Balance of oil seeds		Name and address of the person from whom seeds received for crushing		Quantity received		Total		No of packages issued for crushing seeds		Balance of seeds in stock	
	No of pack-ages	Weight in standard Mds.	No of seeds re-ceived	from	No of pack-ages	Weight in standard Mds.	No of Pack-ages	Weight in standard Mds.	No of Pack-ages	Weight in standard Mds.	No of Packages	Weight in standard Mds.
1	2		3		4		5		6		7	

Opening Balance of Oil		Oil Crushed		Total of Columns		Oil cleared of payment of duty		Name and address of the purchaser		Balance of oil in stock		Remarks
No of tins	Weight	No of tins	Weight	No of tins	Weight	No of tins	Weight			No of tins	Weight	
8		9		10		11		12		13		14

[No C No VI(Y)/6/2/59/Pt/II/46722]

B D DESHMUKH, Collector.

**OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT COLLECTOR OF CENTRAL EXCISE AND LAND
CUSTOMS, GOA FRONTIER DIVISION, BELGAUM**

NOTICES

Belgaum the 17th October 1959

S.O. 2373.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which were seized by the Police Head-Constable attached to Khanapur Station at a place known as "Kherwadi Jungle" in the vicinity of the Indo-Goa border on 14th April 1959 were imported by land from Goa (Portuguese possession in India) in contravention of Section 5(1) of the Land Customs Act 1924 and the Government of India Ministry of Commerce and Industries Import Control Order No. 17/55 dt. 7th December 1955 issued under Section 3 of the Imports and Exports Control Act 1947 and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

Now therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise and Land Customs Goa Frontier Division Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and the FOUR gunny-bags under Section 168 of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

If such a owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-368/59.]

S.O. 2374.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which were seized by the Sub-Inspector of Cen. Ex., Sima Chowkey in Chorla Range at a place known as Talacha Talab in the vicinity of the Indo-Goa border on 25th November 1958 were imported by land (Portuguese possession in India) in contravention of Section 5(1) of the Land Customs Act 1924, and the Government of India, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Import Control Order No. 17/55 dt. 7th December 1955 issued under Section 3 of the Imports and Exports Control Act 1947, and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

Now therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise and Land Customs Goa Frontier Division Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

If such a owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-226/59.]

S.O. 2375.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which were seized by the S.R.P.L/N at Lakarkot, near Banda Godown Bldg., in the vicinity of the Indo-Goa Border on 5th March 1959 were imported by land from Goa (Portuguese possession in India) in contravention of Section 5(1) of the Land Customs Act 1924 and the Government of India, Ministry of Commerce and Industries, Import Control Order No. 17/55 dt. 7th December 1955 issued under Section 3 of the Imports and Exports Control Act 1947 and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

Now therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise and Land Customs Goa Frontier

Division Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

If such a owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-228/59.]

S.O. 2376.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which were

(i) 9 Gunny-bags of betelnuts
weighing 11 B. Mds. and
35 Srs.

seized by the Dy. Supdt. Cus. and C.E.F.S. Savantwadi at Kamatwadi (near Amboli) in the vicinity of the Indo-Goa border on 26th July 1959

were imported by land from Goa (Portuguese possession in India) in contravention of Section 5(1) of the Land Customs Act, 1924 and the Govt. of India, Ministry of Commerce and Industries Import Control Order No. 17/55, dt. 7th December 1955 issued under Section 3 of the Imports and Exports Control Act 1947, and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

Now therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise and Land Customs Goa Frontier Division Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and the 9 gunny-bags (Containers) under Section 168 of the Sea Customs Act 1878, and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

If such a owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-384/59.]

S.O. 2377.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which were

(i) Betel nuts (Husked) 6 B.
Mds. and 37 Srs.

seized by the Inspector of C.E. Sasoli in the Kumbhal Jungle in the vicinity of the Indo-Goa border on 21st February 1959 were imported by land from Goa (Portuguese possession in India) in

contravention of Section 5(1) of the Land Customs Act 1924 and the Govt. of India, Ministry of Commerce and Industries, Import Control Order No. 17/55 dt. 7th December 1955 issued under Section 3 of the Imports and Exports Control Act, 1947 and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

Now therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise and Land Customs Goa Frontier Division Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878, and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act 1924, read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

If such a owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-239/59.]

S.O. 2378.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which were

(i) 30 Boxes each containing 50
Photographic printing
papers.

seized by the Police Inspector, Balgaum City at a place known as Raviwar Peth Belgaum (on the roof of shop of Shri Iswargonda Bharamgonda Patil) on 28th October 1958 were imported

by land in contravention of Section 5(1) of the Land Customs Act 1924 and the Government of India, Ministry of Commerce and Industries, Import Control Order

No. 17/55 dt. 7th December 1955 issued under Section 3 of the Imports and Exports Control Act 1947 and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act 1878 (in respect of item No. 1 noted in the margin).

Now therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise and Land Customs Goa Frontier Division, Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and the 30 boxes under Section 168 of the Sea Customs Act 1878, and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act 1924, read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

If such a owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-171/59.]

S.O. 2379.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which were

- | | |
|---|----------|
| (1) Constantino Portuguese brandy sealed bottles. | 59 Btls. |
| (2) Monterease brandy sealed bottles. | 9 Btls. |
| (3) Johnnie Walker Whiskey sealed bottles. | 14 Btls. |

seized by the Sub-Insp. C. E. AMgaon at a place known as "Lindache Pani" in Chikhali Range (Dodamarg Circle) in the vicinity of the Indo-Goa border on 8th June 1959 were imported by land from Goa (Portuguese possession in India) in contravention of Section 5(1) of the Land Customs Act 1924 and the Govt. of India, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Import Control Order No. 17/55 dt. 7th December 1955 issued under Section 3 of the Imports and Exports

Control Act 1947 and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

Now therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise and Land Customs, Goa Frontier Division, Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and the containers under Section 168 of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

If such a owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-411/59.]

S.O. 2380.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which were

- | |
|---|
| (1) Cotton Sarrees of 9 Yards each. 77 Sarrees. |
|---|

seized by the Inspector of Central Excise Chorla at a place known as Juna Chowkicha Mal in the vicinity of the Indo-Goa border on 17th December 1958 were about to be exported by Land to

Goa (Portuguese Possession in India) in contravention of Section 5(1) of the Land Customs Act 1924 and the Government of India, Ministry of Commerce and Industry Export Control Order No. 1/58 dt. 1st May 1958 issued under Section 3 of the Imports and Exports Control Act 1947, and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

Now therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise and Land Customs, Goa Frontier Division Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

If such a owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-224/59.]

S.O. 2381.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which were

- | | |
|------------|----------------------------|
| (1) Cloves | 3 B. Mds. and
5½ Seers. |
|------------|----------------------------|

seized by the Inspector Central Excise, Flying Squad, Bhedashi at a place known as Hodali Bhedashi in the vicinity of Indo-Goa border on 16th March 1959 were imported by land from Goa (Portuguese possession in India) in contravention of Section 5(1) of the Land Customs Act 1924 and the Govt. of India, Ministry of Commerce and Industries, Import Control Order No. 17/55 dt. 7th December 1955 issued under Sec. 3 of the Imports and Exports Control Act 1947 and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

Now therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise and Land Customs, Goa Frontier Division, Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

If such a owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-223/59.]

S.O. 2382.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which were

- | |
|---|
| (1) Betelnuts in 12 Gunny-Bags, weighing 10 B. Mds. 00 Srs. |
|---|

seized by the Inspector of C.E. Banda at a place in the jurisdiction of Chowkey No. 31, in the vicinity of the Indo-Goa border on 11th August 1959 were imported by land from Goa (Portuguese possession in India) in contravention of Section 5(1) of the Land Customs Act 1924 and the Govt. of India, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Import Control Order No. 17/55 dt. 7th December 1955 issued under Section 3 of the Imports and Exports Control Act 1947 and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

Now therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise and Land Customs, Goa Frontier Division, Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and the 12 gunny bags under Section 168 of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

If such a owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the date of the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-474/59.]

S.O. 2383.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which were

- | |
|--|
| (1) Cloves in 8 Gunny-bags weighing 348 Lbs. |
| (2) Betelnuts in one gunny-bag — 50 Lbs. |

seized by the II S.R.P.P. Hqs. Belgaum at Kalmani in the vicinity of Indo-Goa border on 1st September 1959 were imported by land from Goa (Portuguese possession in India) in contravention of Section 5(1) of the Land Customs Act 1924 and the Govt. of India, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Import Control Order No. 17/55 dt. 7th December 1955 issued under Section 3 of the Imports and Exports Control Act 1947, and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

Now therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise and Land Customs, Goa Frontier Division, Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and the 9 Gunny-bags under Section 168 of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

If such a owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-485/59.]

S.O. 2384.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which were

- | |
|---|
| (1) Five gunny-bags containing betelnuts. 6 B. Mds. 13 Srs. |
| (2) Old Umbrella — 1. |

seized by the Police Head Constable Belgaum city at Mango Garden at village-Savagaon Belgaum on 15th July 1959 were imported by Land (Portuguese Possession in India), in contravention of Section 5(1) of the Land Customs

Act 1924 and the Govt. of India, Ministry of Commerce and Industries Imports Control Order No. 17/55 dt. 7th December 1955 issued under Section 3 of the Imports and Exports Control Act 1947 and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act 1878 (in respect of Item No. 1 noted in the margin).

Now therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise and Land Customs Goa frontier Division Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and the five gunny bags, under Section 168 of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

If such a owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-436/59.]

S.O. 2385.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which were

- | |
|--|
| (1) Betelnuts weighing 10 B. Mds. 5 Seers. |
|--|

seized by the Inspector of C. Ex., Chorla at a place known as Boryacha Tal in the vicinity of the Indo-Goa border on 12th February 1959 were imported by Land (Portuguese possession in

India) in contravention of Section 5(1) of the Land Customs Act 1924, and the Government of India, Ministry of Commerce and Industries, Import Control Order No. 17/55 dt. 7th December 1955 issued under Sec. 3 of the Imports and Exports Control Act 1947 and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act, 1878.

Now therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise and Land Customs Goa frontier Division Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated and under Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

If such a owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-231/59.]

S.O. 2386.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which were

- | |
|---|
| (1) Rust Proof Spring Press Studs in One gunny bag — 35 Boxes Each Box containing 12 Gross. |
| (2) Rust Proof Spring Press Stud in One gunny bag — 27 Boxes. |

seized by the Inspector of C. Excise, Karmal at a place known as "Tambadi Sari" in the vicinity of the Indo-Goa border on 23rd February 1959 were imported by land from Goa (Portuguese possession in India) in contravention of Sec. 5(1) of the Land Customs Act 1924, and the Govern-

ment of India Ministry of Commerce and Industries, Import Control Order No. 17/55 dt. 7th December 1955 issued under Section 3 of the Imports and Exports Control Act 1947, and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

Now therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise and Land Customs Goa frontier Division Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Sec. 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

If such a owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-148/59.]

S.O. 2387.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which were

- | | |
|--|--|
| (1) Japanese Square Mechanical lighters 20 Dozers. | |
| (2) German Press Studs 384 Gross. | |

seized by the Inspector of Central Excise, Chorla at a place known as Talyacha Mal in the vicinity of the Indo-Goa border on 28th November 1958 were imported by land (Portuguese possession in India) in contravention of Section 5(1) of the Land Customs Act 1924 and the Govt.

of India, Ministry of Commerce and Industries Import Control Order No. 17/55 dt. 7th December 1955 issued under Section 3 of the Imports and Exports Control Act 1947 and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act 1878. (In respect of item No. TWO noted in the margin.)

Govt. of India, Ministry of Finance Department (C.R.) Notification No. 17/Cus. dated 7th March 1936 as amended by Ministry of Finance R. D. Notification No. 19/Cus. dated 22nd January 1952 issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act 1878 (In respect of item No. ONE noted in the margin.) :

Now therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise and Land Customs Goa frontier Division Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act, 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act, 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

If such a owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-225/59.]

S.O. 2388.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which were

S. No.	Description	Qty.
1.	Sari Saffron Colour, 9 yds	1
2.	Sari black with white lines	1
3.	Sari 5 Yards.	1
4.	Sky blue 5 Yards.	1
5.	Faint red and blue Sari 5 Yards.	1
6.	-do-	1
7.	Five Yards Sares Asmani colour	1 Pr.
8.	Pair of Dhooties	1 Pr.
9.	Pair of Dhooties two black lines	1
10.	Imitation silver wire reds in bundle 4 in each bundle	32Bd.
11.	Old gunny-bag containing tobacco	20 Srs.
12.	Old gunny-bag containing tobacco	11 Srs
13.	Handbag water-proof	1
14.	Empty carboys Large	5

seized by the S.R.P.F. Party, Commander and his Staff posted at Nijampir (N. Kanara) in Karwar Circle at a place known as "DEOKUFOND" in Chirekhani Range (Karwar Circle) in the vicinity of the Indo-Goa border on 24th July 1959 were about to be exported by Land to Goa (Portuguese Possession in India) in contravention of Section, Export Control Order No. 1/58 dated 1st May 1958 issued under Sec. 3 of the Imports and Exports Control Act 1947 and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act 1878 (in respect of item No. 1 to 12 noted in margin.)

Now, therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Asstt. Collector of Central Excise, Goa fr. Div. Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act. 1878 and the containers and the five empty Khujas at item No. 14 under Section 168 of the Sea Customs Act, 1878 and why a penalty should not be imposed on him

under Sec. 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

If such a owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-401/59.]

Belgaum, the 17th October 1959

S.O. 2389.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which were

- | |
|--|
| (1) Cloves 00 B. Mds. 20 Srs. |
| (2) Press Studs "55" Made in Germany.—960 Gross. |

seized by the Sub-Inspector of C.E. Parwad (Chorla Range) at a place known as "Madacha Valwa" in the vicinity of the Indo-Goa border on 12th August, 1959 were imported by land from Goa (Portuguese possession in India) in contravention of Section 5(1) of the Land Customs Act 1924 and the Government of India, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Import Control Order No. 17/55 dated 7th December, 1955 issued under Section 3 of the Imports and Exports Control Act 1947 and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

Now therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise and Land Customs Goa Frontier Division, Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and the Containers under Section 168 of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

If such an owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-478/59.]

S.O. 2390.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which were

- | |
|--|
| (1) Betelnuts in 9 Gunny-bags weighing 6 B. Mds. 18 Srs. |
|--|

seized by the Customs and S.R.P. Staff posted at Chowkey No. 42 at a place near Chowkey No. 41 in the vicinity of the Indo-Goa border on 21st June, 1959 were imported by land from Goa (Portuguese possession in India) in contravention of Section 5(1) of the Land Customs Act 1924, and the Government of India, Ministry of Commerce and Industries, Import Control Order No. 17/55, dated 7th December, 1955 issued under Section 3 of the Imports and Exports Control Act 1947 and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

Now therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise and Land Customs Goa Frontier Division, Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and the 9 Gunny-bags under Section 168 of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

If such an owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-476/59.]

S.O. 2391.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| (1) Six tea tins | 112 1 bs. |
| (2) 3 Ghce tins | 112 1 bs. |
| (3) 1 Gunny-bag containing Velchi | 30 Srs. |

were seized by the S.R.P.H.C. Batch No. IV/136 and his partymen, posted at Lakarkot at a place known as "Jambalichi Sari" in the Jurisdiction of Chowkey No. 31 in the vicinity of the Indo-Goa border on 21st August, 1959 about to be exported by land to Goa (Portuguese possession in India) in contravention of

Section 5(1) of the Land Customs Act 1924 and the Government of India, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Export Control Order No. 1/58, dated 1st May, 1958 issued under Section 3 of the Imports and Exports Control Act 1947 and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

Now therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise and Land Customs Goa Frontier Division, Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and the containers under Section 168 of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

If such an owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-480/59.]

Belgaum, the 21st October 1959

S.O. 2392.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which were

(1) Press Studs "555" Made
in Germany 2.640Gross.

seized by the Inspector of Central Excise, Chorla at a place known as "Barajanachi—Kondi" in Chorla Range, (Dodamarg Circle) in the vicinity of Indo-Goa border on 18th June, 1959 were imported by land from Goa (Portuguese possession in India) in contravention of Section 5(1) of the Land Customs Act 1924 and the Government of India, Ministry of Commerce and Industries Import Control Order No. 17/55 dated 7th December, 1955 issued under Section 3 of the Imports and Exports Control Act 1947 and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

Now therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise and Land Customs, Goa Frontier Division, Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and the Containers under Section 168 of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

If such an owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-410/59.]

S.O. 2393.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which were

(1) Black Beeds. 44. Bundles.

seized by the S.R.P. Head Constable B. No. 530, and his staff at a place known as "Bhik Dongari" in the jurisdiction of Chowkey No. 7 & 8 in the vicinity of the Indo-Goa border on 4th August, 1959 were imported by land from Goa (Portuguese possession in India) in contravention of Section 5(1) of the Land Customs Act 1924 and the Government of India, Ministry of Commerce and Industries Import Control Order No. 17/55, dated 7th December, 1955 issued under Section 3 of the Imports and Exports Control Act 1947 and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act 1878.

Now therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise and Land Customs Goa Frontier Division, Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878 and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act, 1878.

If such an owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-473/59.]

S.O. 2394.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which were seized by the Head Constable of Police, Ankola at

(i) 7 O'clock blades in a Gunny bag. 50 Cartons, containing 100 blades each.
--

Gabit Keni (Bhavikeri village, Ankola) in the vicinity of Indo-Goa border on 19th April, 1958 were imported by land from Goa (Portuguese possession in India) in contravention of Section 5(1) of the Land Customs Act, 1924, and the Government of India Ministry of Commerce and Industries, Imports Control Order No. 17/55 dated 7th December, 1955 issued under Section 3 of the Imports Control Act, 1947 and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act, 1878.

Now therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise and Land Customs Goa Frontier Division, Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act, 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act, 1878 and the gunny-bag under Section 168 of the Sea Customs Act, 1878 and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act, 1878.

If such an owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-467/59.]

Belgaum, the 22nd October 1959

S.O. 2395.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which were seized by the P.S.I. Khanapur, at a place known as

Packages :
1. Cloves-21 Lbs.
2. Cloves-27 Lbs.
3. Cloves-30 Lbs.
4. Cloves-32 Lbs.
1. Press-Buttons- 48 Cards
2. Press-Buttons- 41 Cards.

'Man Chanpur Railway Gate, in the vicinity of the Indo-Goa border on 13th July, 1959 were imported by land from Goa (Portuguese possession in India) in contravention of Section 5(1) of the Land Customs Act, 1924, and the Government of India, Ministry of Commerce and Industries, Import Control Order No. 17/55 dated 7th December, 1955 issued under Section 3 of the Imports and Exports Control Act, 1947, and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act, 1878 (in respect of item mentioned above noted in the margin).

Now therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise and Land Customs Goa Frontier Division, Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act, 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act, 1878 and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act, 1924 and read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act, 1878.

If such an owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be treated accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-443/59.]

S.O. 2396.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted goods which were seized by the Police Head Constable at Ghotgachi

(tr) Cloves in 6 Gunny-bags weighing buttons- 13½ Srs.
(2) Press buttons-432 Dozs.

Gawal Ain in Matna Range in Dodamarg Circle in the vicinity of Indo-Goa border, on 23rd April, 1959 were imported by land from Goa (Portuguese possession in India) in contravention of Section 5(1) of the Land Customs Act, 1924 and the Government of India Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Import Control Order No. 17/55 dated 7th December, 1955 issued under Section 3 of the Imports and Exports Control Act 1947 and further deemed to have been issued under Section 19 of the Sea Customs Act, 1878.

Now therefore, any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise and Land Customs, Goa Frontier Division, Belgaum why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under

Section 5(3) of the Land Customs Act 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act, 1878 and the containers under Section 168 of the Sea Customs Act, 1878 and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1)(c) of the Land Customs Act, 1924 read with Section 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act, 1878.

If such an owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned unclaimed goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Government of India Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII(b)10-412/59.]

E. R. SRIKANTIA, Asstt. Collector.

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

New Delhi, the 24th October 1959

S O. 2397.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 (65 of 1951), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri M. N. Pittie, a representative of the Indian Sugar Mills Association, as a member of the Development Council for Sugar Industry, with effect from the 17th May, 1959, *vice* Shri K. K. Birla, who resigned his membership from the said date and makes the following amendment in the Order of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry S.R.O. 2002, dated the 24th September, 1958, namely:—

In the said Order—for entry No. 2, relating to Shri K. K. Birla, the following entries shall be substituted, namely:—

“2. Shri M. N. Pittie,

Messrs. Harinagar Sugar Mills Limited,
207 Kalbadevi Road,
Bombay.”

[No. 4(43)IA(II)(G)/59.]

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 24th October 1959

S.O. 2398.—/IDRA/6/3—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 (65 of 1951), the Central Government hereby appoints Dr. D. R. Malhotra as a member of the Development Council established by the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry S.O. 954, dated the 25th April, 1959, for the scheduled industry engaged in the manufacture and production of Non-ferrous metals including alloys (and semi-manufactures thereof) and directs that the following amendment shall be made in the said Order, namely:—

In the said Order, after entry No 13B, relating to Dr. B. R. Nijhawan, the following entries shall be inserted, namely:—

“13C. Dr. D. R. Malhotra,
Golf Road,
Ajmer, (India).

“technical knowledge”

“Member”

[No. 4(73)IA(II)(G)/58]

S O. 2399/IDRA/6/15.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 (65 of 1951), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri D. M. Trivedi to be a member of the Development Council for the scheduled industries engaged in the manufacture or production of alcohol and other products of fermentation industries and makes the following amendment in the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry Order No. S.R.O. 1904, dated the 16th September, 1958, namely:—

In the said Order, under the category of “persons who, in the opinion of the Central Government are capable of representing the interests of consumers of goods manufactured or produced by the said scheduled

industries" after entry No. 13 relating to Shri M. A. Ekambaram, the following entry shall be inserted:—

"13A. Shri D. M. Trivedi,
Works Manager,
M/s. Polychem Ltd.,
100, Ghodbunder Road (B.S.D.),
Goregaon."

[No. 4(20)IA(II)(G)/59.]

A. K. CHAKRAVARTI, Under Secy.



(Indian Standards Institution)

New Delhi, the 16th October 1959

S.O 2400.—In pursuance of sub-rule (1) of rule 4 of the Indian Standard Institution (Certification Marks) Rules, 1955, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Standard Marks, designs of which together with the verbal description of the design and title of the relevant Indian Standards are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been specified.

These Standard Marks, for the purpose of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Act, 1952 and the rules and regulations framed thereunder, shall come into force with effect from 19th October 1959.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Designs of the Standard Mark	Product/Class of product to which applicable	No. and title of relevant Indian Standard	Verbal description of the design of the Standard
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1		Sodium Acetate, Technical.	IS : 557-1954 Specification for Sodium Acetate, Technical and Photographic.	The monogram of the Indian Standards Institution consisting of letters ISI, drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in column (2), the number designation of the Indian Standard being inscribed in the top side of the monogram and the words "TECHNICAL" subscribed under the bottom side of the monogram as indicated in the design.
2		Waterproof Packing Paper.	IS : 293-1951 Code for Seaworthy Packaging of Cotton Textiles.	The monogram of the Indian Standards Institution, consisting of letters ISI, drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in column (2). The words "WATERPROOF PAPER" and the number designation of the Indian Standard being subscribed under the bottom side of the monogram as indicated in the design.

[No. 4MDC/11(5)]

New Delhi, the 19th October 1959

S.O. 2401.—In pursuance of sub-regulations (2) and (3) of regulation 3 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Indian Standards, particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been established during the period 1st October 1959 to 15th October 1959.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. and title of the Indian Standard established	No. and title of the Indian Standard or Standards, if any, superseded by the new Indian Standard	Brief Particulars
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	IS : 1151-1958 Specification for Refined Sugar.	..	This standard prescribes the requirements and the methods of test for refined sugar (Price Rs. 1.50).
2	IS : 1309-1958 Specification for Endrin, Technical.	..	This standard prescribes the requirements and the methods of test for endrin, technical employed in the preparation of insecticidal formulations (Price Rs. 2.00).
3	IS : 1321-1958 Specification for Hawser-Laid Sisal Rope.	..	This standard prescribes requirements for hawser-laid sisal rope, 25 to 457 mm (or 1 to 18 in.) in size (Price Rs. 2.50).
4	IS : 1371-1958 Specification for Shroud-Laid Sisal Rope.	..	This standard prescribes requirements for shroud-laid sisal rope, 25 mm to 457 mm (or 1 to 18 in.) in size (Price Rs. 2.50).

Copies of these Indian Standards are available for sale with the Indian Standards Institution "Manak Bhavan", 9, Mathura Road, New Delhi-1 and also at its Branch Offices at (i) General Assurance Building, 232 Dr. Dadabhoy Naoroji Road, Fort, Bombay-1, (ii) P-11, Mission Row Extension, Calcutta-1, and (iii) 2/21, First Line Beach, Madras-1.

[No. MDC/11(4)]

S.O. 2402.--In pursuance of regulation 4 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955 the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that amendment to the Indian Standard given in the Schedule hereto annexed has been issued under the powers conferred by sub-regulation (1) of regulation 3 of the said regulations.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. and title of the Indian Standard amended	No. & Date of Gazette Notification in which the establishment of the Indian Standard was notified	No. & Date of Amendment	Brief particulars of Amendment	Date of effect of the amendment
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1	IS:693-1955 Specification for Varnished Cambric Insulated Cables for Electricity Supply (Tentative)	S.R.O. 1597 dated 14th July 1956	No. 1 October 1959	(i) In clause 9.2 (b), line 3 please read 'or' for 'and' (ii) The first sentence in sub-clause 10.2.2 has been deleted and substituted by a new sentence reading as under : "The thickness of insulation shall be determined by	1st November 1959

1	2	3	4	5	6
				bunching together the individual strips of tape removed from the finished cable (without removing the lubricant) and measuring the total thickness with a micrometer having the characteristics defined under 10.2.2.1."	
				(iii) In Table VII, col. (6) please substitute '0.03' for the third entry '0.08'.	

Copies of this amendment slip are available, free of cost, with the Indian Standards Institution, 'Manak Bhavan', 9 Mathura Road, New Delhi-1 and also at its Branch Offices at (i) General Assurance Building, 232, Dr. Dadabhoy Naoroji Road, Fort, Bombay-1, (ii) P-22 Mission Row Extension, Calcutta-1, and (iii) 2/21 First Line Beach, Madras-1.

[No. MDC/11(9)]

S.O. 2403.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-regulations (2) and (3) of regulation 3 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies the issue of errata slips, particulars of which are given in column (4) of the Schedule hereto annexed, in respect of the Indian Standards specified in column (2) of the said Schedule.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. and title of Indian Standard	No. and date of Gazette Notification in which establishment of Indian Standard was notified	Particulars of Errata Slip Issued
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	IS : 1231-1958 Dimensions of Three-Phase Induction Motors.	S.O. 1231 dated 30th May 1959	At page 4, Fig. 1 has been substituted by a new figure.

Copies of this errata slip are available, free of cost, with the Indian Standards Institution, "Manak Bhavan", 9 Mathura Road, New Delhi-1 and also at its Branch Office at (i) General Assurance Building, 232 Dr. Dadabhoy Naoroji Road, Fort, Bombay-1, (ii) P-11 Mission Row Extension, Calcutta-1 and (iii) 2/21 First Line Beach, Madras-1.

[MDC/11(10)]

S.O. 2404.—In pursuance of regulation 4 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that amendments to the Indian Standards given in the schedule hereto annexed have been issued under the powers conferred by sub-regulation (1) of regulation 3 of the said regulations.

THE SCHEDULE

Serial No.	No. and title of the Indian Standard amended	No. and Date of Gazette Notification in which the establishment of the Indian Standard was notified	No. and date of amendment	Brief particulars of Amendment	Date of effect of the Amendment
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1	IS : 561-1958 Specification for BHC Dusting Powders (<i>Revised</i>).	S.O. 1438 dated 27 June, 1959.	No. 1 October 1959	Clause 3.3.1 on moisture content and Appendix B prescribing the method for determination of moisture content have been deleted.	1st October 1959
2	IS : 562-1958 Specification for BHC Water Dispersible Powder Concentrates (<i>Revised</i>).	Do.	No. 1 October 1959	Clause 3.2.1. on moisture content and Appendix B prescribing the method for determination of moisture content have been deleted.	1st October 1959
3	IS : 564-1955 Specification for DDT Dusting Powders.	S.R.O. 13 dated 7th January 1956.	No. 2 October 1959	Clause 3.3.1 on moisture content and Appendix B prescribing the method for determination of moisture content have been deleted.	1st October 1959
4	IS : 565-1955 Specification for DDT Water Dispersible Powder Concentrates.	S.R.O. 13 dated 7th January 1956.	No. 3 October 1959	Clause 3.2.1. on moisture content and Appendix B prescribing the method for determination of moisture content have been deleted.	1st October 1959

Copies of these amendment slips are available, free of cost, with the Indian Standards Institution, 'Manak Bhavan' 9 Mathura Road, New Delhi-1, and will be made available in due course at its Branch Offices at (i) General Assurance Building, 232 Dr. Dadabhai Naoroji Road, Fort, Bombay-1, (ii) P-11 Mission Row Extension, Calcutta-1, and (iii) 2/21 First Line Beach, Madras-1.

[No. MDC/11 (9)]
C. N. MODAWAL,
Deputy Director (Marks).

MINISTRY OF STEEL, MINES & FUEL**(Department of Mines & Fuel)***New Delhi-2, the 23rd October 1959*

S.O. 2405.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 4 of the Coal Mines (Conservation and Safety) Act, 1952 (12 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri B. K. Ghosh, Deputy Coal Controller (Production), as a member of the Coal Board for a further period of one month with effect from the 22nd October, 1959.

2. It is hereby notified for general information that the Coal Board now consists of the following persons who have been appointed by the Central Government as Chairman and members thereof, with effect from the respective dates shown against each, namely:—

			<i>Date of appointment</i>
1.	Shri A. Zaman, I.C.S., Coal Controller	Chairman	3-1-1959 (A.N.)
2.	Shri S.S. Grewal, Chief Inspector of Mines.	Member	2-4-1954 (reappointed with effect from 2-4-1959).
3.	Shri B. K. Ghosh, Deputy Coal Controller (Production).	Member	22-4-1958.
4.	Shri S.G. Krishnan, Chief Mining Adviser, Eastern Railway, Dhanbad.	Member	28-4-1959.
5.	Shri S. Mukherjee, Chief Mining Engineer, Coal Board.	Member	21-12-1957.

[No. C5-1(9)/59.]
CHHEDI LAL, Dy. Secy.

MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE**(Department of Agriculture)***New Delhi, the 24th October 1959*

S.O. 2406.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955 (10 of 1955), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendments in the Fruit Products Order, 1955, namely:

In the Second Schedule of the said Order,

(1) In Part X "Specifications for fruit chutneys", under the column "General Characteristics", the following shall be added after the existing entry, namely:—

"The minimum acidity of the product shall be 0.75 per cent as acetic acid. The ash content shall not exceed 5.0 per cent.

(2) After Part XI, the following Part shall be added, namely:—

PART XI A*Specifications for vegetable soups*

<i>Product</i>	<i>Variety</i>	<i>General Characteristics</i>
Vegetable Soup	Any suitable variety of vegetable or combination of vegetables.	The product shall be made from vegetable or vegetables free from insect or fungal attack. All the ingredients used in the preparation of the soup shall be thoroughly cleaned. The only substances that may be added are vegetable pulp, vegetables, milk solids, starch, rice, wheat, cereals and their extruded products, butter, onion, permitted colours, soup flavour and spices. It shall be of good keeping quality and shall show no sign of fermentation when incubated at 37°C and 55°C for one week. No preservative shall be used. The finished product shall have the flavour characteristic of the vegetable from which soup is made. The soup shall have uniform consistency.

(3) In Part XXIII, the following shall be inserted as a foot-note, namely:—

“In fruit products, Sodium Alginate, Calcium Chloride, Calcium Lactate, Calcium Bi-carbonate and other soluble Calcium salts may be added.”

[No. F. 4-32/59-AM.]

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 20th October 1959

S.O. 2407.—In the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Department of Agriculture) notification No. S.O. 1443, dated the 16th June, 1959, published on page 1461 of the Gazette of India, Part II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii), dated the 27th June, 1959, for ‘Creamery Butter Grading and Marketing Rules 1941’, read ‘Creamery Butter for Grading and Marking Rules, 1941’.

This supersedes the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Department of Agriculture) notification No. S.O. 1869, dated the 21st August, 1959 published on page 2060 of the Gazette of India, Part II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii), dated the 29th August, 1959.

[No. F. 3-1/59-AM.]

V. S. NIGAM, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF HEALTH

New Delhi-2, the 16th October 1959

S.O. 2408.—In pursuance of the provisions of clause (vi) of sub-section (2) of section 5 of the Drugs Act, 1940 (23 of 1940), the Central Government hereby nominates Dr. P. M. Toshniwal, M.Sc., Ph.D., Government Analyst, Government of Madhya Pradesh, to be a member of the Drugs Technical Advisory Board in place of Dr. A. C. Chatterjee who has retired from the post of Government Analyst, Uttar Pradesh.

[No. F. 4-6/59-D.]

B. S. SRIKANTIAH, Dy Secy.

MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT & COMMUNICATIONS

(Department of Transport)

(Transport Wing)

PORTS

New Delhi, the 26th October 1959

S.O. 2409.—In pursuance of sub-section (2) of section 6 of the Calcutta Port Act, 1890 (Bengal Act III of 1890), it is hereby notified that in accordance with the provisions of section 16 of the said Act Shri Dharendra Nath Bose, Councillor, Calcutta Corporation, Calcutta has been elected by the Corporation of Calcutta to be a Commissioner for the Port of Calcutta *vice* Shri Bejoy Kumar Banerjee, resigned.

[No. 9-PG(90)/59.]

MISS I. INDIRA, Under Secy.

(Department of Communications and Civil Aviation)

(P. & T.)

New Delhi, the 31st October 1959

S.O. 2410.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 16 of the Indian Post Office Act, 1898 (6 of 1898), the Central Government hereby

makes the following further amendment in the Indian Post Office Rules, 1933, namely:—

In the said rules, in rule 183, for item (tt), the following item shall be substituted, namely:—

“(tt) The General Manager, Bihar State Road Corporation, Bombay State Road Corporation or Saurashtra State Road Corporation, provided that the articles posted by any such General Manager relate solely to the business of the Corporation, of which he is the General Manager”.

[No. 24-13/59-CI.]

B. G. DESHMUKH, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 22nd October 1959

S.O. 2411.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 8 of the Provident Funds Act, 1925 (XIX of 1925), the Central Government hereby directs that the provisions of the said Act shall apply to the provident fund established for the benefit of the employees of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, New Delhi.

[No. 15(36)/57-SRI.]

M. M. MALHOTRA, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF WORKS, HOUSING & SUPPLY

New Delhi, the 21st October 1959

S.O. 2412.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1958 (32 of 1958), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply No. S.O. 1104, dated the 7th May, 1959, namely:—

In the said notification, for the existing entry under column I against item 27, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

“All Circle Military Estate Officers.”

[No. 14/2/59-Acc.]

R. C. MEHRA, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 22nd October 1959

S.O. 2413.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Requisitioning and Acquisition of Immovable Property Act, 1952 (30 of 1952) and in supersession of this Ministry's notification No. EV. 11(6)/55, dated the 18th January, 1956, the Central Government hereby directs that the powers exercisable by it by or under the provisions of the said Act, specified in column 3 of the Schedule hereto annexed shall also be exercisable by the authority mentioned in the corresponding entry in column 2 of the schedule in respect of any property situated within its jurisdiction subject to the condition specified in the corresponding entry in column 4 thereof.

SCHEDULE

S. No.	Authority	Provision of the Act	Conditions
1	2	3	4
1	The Director of Estates, New Delhi.	8(i) (a)	The powers under section 8(i) (a) relating to the fixation of compensation by agreement shall be exercisable to the limit of annual compensation of Rs. 3000/-only.

[No. EE. 11(2)/59.]

S.O. 2414.—In pursuance of clause (b) of section 2 of the Requisitioning and Acquisition of Immovable Property Act, 1952, (30 of 1952), and in partial modification of the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Works, Production and Supply No. S.R.O. 151, dated the 28th January, 1952, the Central Government hereby authorises each of the officers mentioned in column 1 of the subjoined Table to perform the functions of the competent authority under the said Act, for the areas specified in the corresponding entry in column 2 of the said Table.

THE TABLE

Officers	Areas
1	2
The Director of Estates, New Delhi	The whole of the Union territory of Delhi, and within the jurisdiction of the Simla Municipality.
The Deputy Director of Estates, New Delhi	The whole of the Union territory of Delhi.

[No. EE. 11(2)/59.]

S. P. SAKSENA, Dy. Secy.

MINISTRY OF REHABILITATION

(Office of the Chief Settlement Commissioner)

New Delhi, the 17th October 1959

S.O. 2415.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that it is necessary to acquire the evacuee properties specified in the Schedule hereto annexed in the State of Uttar Pradesh for a public purpose, being a purpose connected with the relief and rehabilitation of displaced persons, including payment of compensation to such persons;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 12 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954), it is notified that the Central Government has decided to acquire, and hereby acquires, the evacuee properties specified in the Schedule hereto annexed.

THE SCHEDULE DISTRICT GONDA—U.P.

Sl. No.	Name of Village	Name of evacuee	Accommodation	Boundaries
1	2	3	4	5
1	Bhonka, Teh./Distt. Gonda.	Shamshul Haq Khan S/o Ashraf Khan.	One Verandah & one Room	N. Gali, S. Gali, E. Gali, Parti, Area 11 × 9 yds.
2	Do.	Mohd. Khalil S/o Ilahi Bux.	Two Dalañ and one Angan	N. Maidan, S. Maidan & Rasta, E. Rasta, W. Well & Parti, Area 12 × 10, 1/2 yds.
3	Do.	Noorul Haq S/o Mohd. Taufiq	Khandher	N. Door of Idris, S. Leikh, E. House of Mohd. Jama, W. Chaupal of Shamshul Haq, Area 3 × 3 yds.

1	2	3	4	5
4	Bhonka, Teh./Distt. Gonda.	Tahr Khan, Khan Mohd. S/o Kudrat Khan.	Khandher	N. Leikh & Parti, S. Parti & Gudaha, E. Parti & Leikh, W. Leikh, Area 11 x 9 yds.
5	Do.	Sayed Ahmd S/o Nahar Mohd.	Do.	N. House of Abdul Hai, S. Khan- dher of Shamsbul Haq, E. Hara of Abdul Mazid, W. H/O Panchayet, Area 2, 1/2 x 2, 1/2 yds.
6	Do.	Niaz Ahmed S/o Idu	Thached house	N. H/O Murtaza Khan, S. Gali, E. Leikh, W. Gali, Area 8 x 10 1/2 yds.
7	Do.	Mohd. Rafiq Khan S/o Raunak Khan	Two rooms only	N. Tree of Mahuwa, S. H/O Hasan Raza, E. Leikly W. Hata of Ni- zammudin, Area 15 x 12 yds.
8	Akhrewa	Mohd. Sadik Khan S/o Kechan Khan	Khandher 1/2 one room thetch	N. Field of Yusuf Khan, S. Gali, E. Field of Mustafa Khan, W. Gali, Area 14 x 8 yds.
9	Patsa	Bhaggan Khan S/o Najjab Khan	Thached House Two rooms	N. Parti & Ghoor, S. Trec of Pa- karia, E. Leikh, W. Field of Murad, Area 10, 1/2 x 6 yds.
10	Tahdewa Tappa Khiroपुर, Teh/ Distt. Gonda.	Şamiullah Khan	Ruined House	N. Leikh, S. Tank E. Hata, W. Parti & Ghoor, Area, 12 x 10 yds.
11	Sekhan Chak	Abdul Jamil Khan S/o Ali Jan.	Do.	N. H/O Khirdhir Lambardar S. H/O. Habib Khan E. H/O Izad Khan W. H/O Imtayaz Khan, Area 8 1/2 x 4 yds.
12	Pipra Pudurnn	Razak S/o Muzahim	Two rooms & Usara	N. Field, S. Field, E. Filed, W. Parti, Area, 12, 1/2 x 10, 1/2 yds.
13	Paraspur	Hamidulla S/o Kaney	Khandher	N. Leikh, S. Leikh, E. H/O. Ghasita Khan, W. Channi of Ghasita Khan, Area 20 x 16 yds.
14	Barauli	Kasim S/o Lal Mohd.	Khandher	N. Kabristan, S. H/O Bhagauti Singh, E. H/O. Ali Bux, W. H/O. Mumtaz, Area 9 x 7 yds.

1	2	3	4	5
15	Bishnoherpur	Rasool Bux S/o Paigambar Bux.	3 Rooms	N. H/O Ram Avadh S. H/O Bipin Behari, E. Field of Ram Avadh, Umrao, W. Tree of Neem and Rasta, Area 12 x 10, 1/2 yds.
16	Pira Khas	Mohd. Ishaq	3 rooms one Veran- dah & Angan Khaprail	N. H/O. Rozan, S. H/O Patan Dhobi, E. H/O Fakir Mohd., W. H/O. Nahar Kunjra, Area 8, 1/2 x 7, 1/2 yds.
17	Do.	Abdul Wahab	One Khaprail 3 rooms One Veran- dah.	N. H/O Abdul Zab- bar, S. Garha & Rasta, E. H/O. Hussain Bux, W. H/O Khalil Ahmed, Area, 7, 1/2 x 8, 1/2 yds.
18	Rehra	Dilawar Hussain, Bahadur Hussain S s/o Tasudduk Hussain.	Pakka House	N. Field of Hashim Begum, S. H/O. Sanchi, E. Kolhar, W. Well & Parti, & Rasta Area 30 x 16 yds.

[No. 2(5)Policy-II/59.]

New Delhi, the 19th October 1959

S.O.2416 Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that it is necessary to acquire the evacuee properties in the Union territory of Delhi specified in the Schedule below for a public purpose, being a purpose connected with the relief and rehabilitation of displaced persons, including payment of compensation to such persons;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 12 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954), it is notified that the Central Government has decided to acquire, and hereby acquires, the said evacuee properties.

THE SCHEDULE

S. No.	Particulars of evacuee property	Name of the town and locality in which the evacuee property is situated	Name of evacuee	Parentage of evacuee
1	VII/2631-32/4434-36	Gali Shahtara Delhi.	Nitholi.	Son of Pir Bux.
2	VII/1794-B/2909-10	Mohalla Shahgunj Delhi.	Haji Abdul Latif.	
3	I/265 3/4(Old)446(New)	Ganda Nala Delhi	Rehman Bux.	
4	VII/1238 1/1791	Katra Sheikh Chand.	Adul Latif.	
5	VII/1238 2/3 1792	Katra Sheikh Chand.	Din Mohamed.	
6	VII/2453-53A/3836 & 3873.	Shah Gunj Delhi	Mst. Sarwari Begum.	Wife of Imtazuddin.
7	VI/2468/4993.	Kucha Rehman	Abdul Wahib.	
8	VIII/88/170	Gali Bandoq Wali.	Abdul Rehman.	
9	XV/5664-65/4515	Pahar Ganj, Delhi	Azisuddin.	Son of Qamaruddin.
10	IX/2197-98/3823-24 (New)	Gali Hafiz Banna, Churi Walan, Delhi.	Shamsuddin and Noor Mohamed,	Sons of Noor Baksh.

New Delhi, the 20th October 1959

S.O. 2417.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that it is necessary to acquire certain evacuee properties in the Union territory of Delhi specified in schedule below for a public purpose, being a purpose connected with the relief and rehabilitation of displaced persons, including payment of compensation to such persons;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 12 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954), it is notified that the Central Government has decided to acquire, and hereby acquires, the evacuee properties specified in the Schedule below.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Particulars of Khewat No.	Khsara No.	Area		Name of the evacuee with the rights in property
			Big.	Big.	
1	60/260 Village Haiderpur	449/1	10	3	Mohd. Yaha and Mohd. Yusuf and Habib-ul-Rehman, sons with the share 1/4, Shamshul Nasa and Kharnul Nasa, daughters with the share 1/4, out of 7/8 share and the remaining 1/8 share with Lahi-qul Nasa w/o Azis-ul-Rehman, evacuees with ownership rights.

[No. 1(5) Policy-II/59.]

S.O. 2418.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that it is necessary to acquire the evacuee properties specified in the Schedule hereto annexed, in the State of Bihar for a public purpose, being a purpose connected with the relief and rehabilitation of displaced persons including payment of compensation to such persons;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 12 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954), it is notified that the Central Government has decided to acquire, and hereby acquires, the evacuee properties specified in the Schedule hereto annexed.

THE SCHEDULE.

DISTRICT - MONGHYR

Agricultural land.—

Sl. No.	Particulars of the evacuee property	Name of the town & locality, village in which the property is situated		Name of evacuee
1	2	3	4	
1	Khata 24 Khesra 217 } 219 } 223 } 224 } 221 }	A.D. 133 1/2 Village Bourn, P.S. Moffo-sil.	Noor Hassan & others of Hakimpur P.S. Moffossil. C. P. No 160 of 1960	
3*				

1	2	3	4
2	7 8 9 22 32 35 42 43 48 49 64 65 67 68 69 39	0.38 0.39 0.33 1.25 0.98 1.49 0.10 1.14 0.32 0.84 0.27 0.33 0.43 0.18 0.9 0.69	Touzi No. 443 Mouza Jan- kikita. Bashir Mian s/o Alijan Mian of Azimganj, P.S. Moffosil, E.P. 44 of 1953.
		9.21 acres	
I	45 4 219 222 223	1.57 2.11 0.79 1.16 0.18	
		5.81 acres	
32	42 79 83 86	2.41 0.48 0.52 0.92	
1	14	0.72	
33	143	0.7	
		5.12 acres	
	TOTAL	20.14 acres	
3	0076 B.K.D. (Old) 4 0 8 1529 (new)	Village Choramba also known as Gondarchak T.N. 1640 C.W. No. D. P.S. Moffosil.	Sk. Majid s/o Gondi of village Choramba P.S. Wawn E.P. Case No. 1631.
4	279 889 2 15 13	Mouza Tulsipur T. No. 804 Thana No. 390 P.S. Teghra.	Chota Muslim S/o Jhalu Mian of village Phulwaria P.S. Teghra E.P. No. 00 of 52.
5	I 1/M I „ I „ I „ I „ I „ I „	1 12 5 5 0 0 4 11 0 3 0 0 2 0 0 1 0 0 3 0 0	To-uzi No. 1387, Village Shankershyam P.S. Gogri. MD Hafiz Abdullah Bibi Azimunissa & Md. Abbas. E.P. No. 8 of 1952.
		20 3 5	
6	145 & 241	114 } 118 } 119 } 113 } 40 bigha 1127 } 1128 } 1097 } 1082 } 1363 } A.D.	Villag Bankatti, P.S. Bakhtdarpur. Nurul Muda of Begusaraj, E. P. 12/VIII of 1949-50.

1	2	3	4
7	131	113 0.54 123 0.36 124 0.10 207 0.57 208 0.31 209 0.27 <hr/> 2.04	Village Kalyanpur, P.S. Kharagpur. Munshi Mian & Wahidad Mian of Kalyanpur, F.P. 10 of 1952.
8	32	609 2.78	Touzi No. 5535 Village Phulaiya P.S. Lakhisarai. Badruddin of Phulaiya E.P. 16 of 1954.
9	517	655 0.19 686 0.86 982 0.80 1013 0.32 646 0.35 652 0.36 857 0.83 <hr/> 3.71	Village Farda P.S. Mof-fossil (Singhia) T. N. 4990. Habib Mian s/o Washir Khan of Maksuspur, Monghyr E P. 77 of 1954.
10	44	99 0.50	T. N. 1344 Village Salimpur Kunda. Bibi Hussain W/o Md. Yunus of Sutturkhana E. P. 201 of 1954.
11	4	B. K. D. 468 1 18 13 264 2 1 14 403 1 12 19 818 1 12 11 819 7 2 15 830 1 3 5 419 2 4 0 717 4 12 4 886 7 10 6 715 3 10 17 538 0 13 3 655 3 14 18 667 3 14 5 885 8 3 7 301 850 6 1 4 291 637 0 7 2 172 648 0 18 7 289 129 0 0 11 277 415 0 5 4 116 669 1 2 9 105 320 1 16 10 303 1026 13 6 4 303 305/1 2 5 7 303 305/2 0 6 8 359 2 19 11 84 10 12 6 856/6 2 19 11 879 6 16 2 181/3 0 13 6 665 2 14 1 <hr/> 110 16 5	T. N. 4920 Village Bal-kunda P. S. Chouthan Thana No. 178. Mirza Sakoor Beg of Top-khanabazar, Monghyr.
	856 } 825 } 885 } 2234 2235 2239 2242 549 1786 1788	0 6 13 0 0 12 0 11 0 0 1 0 2 6 0 0 0 18	Village Sorounja P. S. Bakhtiarpur Touzi No. 1988 Jagir Karmu Khan T.N. No. 2467 Jagir Alahar.

I	2	3	4
	1798	0 1 17	
	1820	0 6 8	
	1822	0 5 1	
1944	5931	0 11 0	T. N. 3074
1422	5933	0 3 0	Jagir Amnat
	4948	0 11 0	
	5022	0 5 14	(House)
	5023	0 2 14	
	5024	0 4 0	
221	357	} 5 1 13½	T. N. 1973 Jagir Wadullah.
	358		
	359		
	373		
<hr/> 9B-15K-11½ dhurs.			

GRAND TOTAL 120 Bigha 11 katha 16 1/2 dhurs.

		A	D		
12	258	1871	0 12		
		2476	0 49½	Village Amrath P. S.	Most. Bibi Rabiya Khatoon W/o
		2477	0 17¾	Jamui.	Hadin of village Amrath E.P.
		2440	0 18		21 of 1953.
		2472	0 4		
		1909	0 1½		
		2195/2511	0 1½		
		1375	0 2½		
<i>Rural Houses</i>					
1	One house	.	.	Village Matadih P.S.	Kabir Bux S/o Rahim Bux.
				Moffossil.	
2	Do.	.	.	Village Barajore P.S. Jhajha	Huro Mina S/o Pokha.
3	Do.	.	.	Village Do.	Sammar Mian S/o Amir Mian.
4	Do.	.	.	Do.	Do.
5	Do.	.	.	Village Hamra P. S. Begu-	Poona Das.
				sani.	
6	Do.	.	.	Village Norepur P. S. Bach-	Zulekha S/o Md. Tehr.
				wara.	
7	Do.	.	.	Village Eana P.S. Teghra	Ghaste Khan.
8	Do.	.	.	Village Lakmania P.S. Ballia	Md. Zabir.
9	Do.	.	.	Village Quashba P.S. Ballia.	Md. Zarif.
10	Do.	.	.	Village Sanha P.S. Ballia	Md. Haidar.
11	Do.	.	.	Hassanpur P.S. Ballia.	Foudi Gope.
12	Do.	.	.	Village Ahoke P.S. Ballia	Md. Basiruddin
13	Do.	.	.	Village Sanha P.S. Ballia	Syed Md. Ashique.

[No. 7(12) Policy-II/58].

M. L. PURI,

Settlement Commissioner and *Ex-Officio* Under Secretary.

(Office of the Chief Settlement Commissioner)

New Delhi, the 22nd October 1959

S.O. 2419.—In exercise of the powers conferred on me by Sub-Section (2) of Section 10 of the Displaced Persons (Claims) Supplementary, Act, 1954 (12 of 1954) I have delegated to Shri Sewak Ram Anand, Assistant Settlement Commissioner, with effect from the 1st October, 1959, the following powers of the Chief Settlement Commissioner namely:—

1. Power to require a Settlement Officer to appoint one or more persons to advise him in any proceeding pending before him, under Sub-Section (2) of Section 6 of the said Act.
2. Power to transfer any case pending before a Settlement Officer to another Settlement Officer under Section 7 of the said Act.

3. Power to call for the record of any case decided by the Settlement Officer cases decided under the displaced persons (Claims) Act, 1950 (44 of 1950).
4. Special power of revision under Section (5) of the said Act in respect of cases decided of the said Act in respect of cases decided under the displaced persons (Claims) Act, 1950 (44 of 1950).

[No. 11-A(56)CSC/AI/59.]

L. J. JOHNSON,
Chief Settlement Commissioner.

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

New Delhi, the 22nd October 1959

S.O. 2420.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Delhi, in the matter of applications under Section 33A of the said Act from certain workmen of the Palana Colliery.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, DELHI

PRESENT

Shri E. Krishna Murti, Central Government Industrial Tribunal.

1st October 1959

APPLICATION U/S 33A OF THE INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE ACT, 1947.

I.D. No. 222 of 1959

Shri Bhaira Ram s/o Uda Ra, Signal Man, c/o Palana Colliery, Mazdoor Union, Administrative Office, Khazanchi Building, K.E.M. Road, Bikaner—Applicant.

AND

The management of Palana Colliery, Palana.—*Opposite Party.*

In the matter of Reference I.D. No. 81 of 1958.

Dr. Jawahar Lal—*for the applicant.*

Shri M. G. Fell—*for the opposite party.*

AWARD

This is a petition under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The petitioner, Shri Bhaira Ram, states that he is a permanent workman of the Colliery that he was a Signalman, that the post was changed into that of an Underground Timber Mazdoor, that he was down graded from Category VI to Category IV, and that this action of the management should be got rectified.

3. The contention on behalf of the management is, that there is no contravention of Section 33, that there is no alteration of the conditions of service, that the applicant was working as a Signalman previously, that however with effect from 14th June, 1958, the old pits were stopped, that there is no haulage in the present working pits, that accordingly there was no job of signalman, that he was asked to do the work of Underground Timber Mazdoor that he is getting the same wages as he was getting as Signalman in Category No. VI that there is no change in the conditions of service, and that he is not entitled to the relief claimed.

4. The issues, that arise for determination, are:—

(1) Whether the petition, as brought, is maintainable?

(2) To what relief, if any, is the petitioner entitled?

Issues No. 1 and 2—

5. It is admitted by the management in their counter, that the petitioner was working as a Signalman. However, his designation was changed to that of an Underground Timber Mazdoor. The explanation is, however, given, that because

the old pits were stopped from 14th June, 1958, there was no haulage in the present working pits, and, therefore, there was no place for him as Signalman. He was asked to do the duty of Underground Timber Mazdoor. His services were however not affected. It is admitted before me by Mr. Fell, that his category is even now that of a Signalman, and that he is being paid wages as applicable to Category No. VI. Mr. Fell stated, before me, that this workman would be continued to be paid wages as a workman under Category No. VI. In view of this assurance, there is no reason for the petitioner to feel aggrieved by the mere change in designation. As explained by the management, there was no need for a Signalman from 14th June, 1958, because the work in the old pits was stopped. I find, that there has been no alteration in the conditions of service of the workman, and that he is not entitled to any relief in this proceeding, except to state, that he will continue to be paid the wages due to him as for a workman in Category No. VI.

6. In the result, the petition is dismissed, except that it is made clear, that the workman shall be paid wages as for a workman in Category No. VI. No order as to costs.

7. An award is passed accordingly.

(Two pages)

The 1st October, 1959.

E. KRISHNA MURTI,

Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Delhi.

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, DELHI
PRESENT**

Shri E. Krishna Murti, Central Government Industrial Tribunal
1st October, 1959.

APPLICATION U/S 33A OF THE INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE ACT, 1947.

I.D. No. 223 OF 1959

Adu Ram, S/o Ladu Ram, Pointsman c/o Palana Colliery, Mazdoor Union, Administrative Office, Khazanchi Building, K.E.M. Road, Bikaner.—*Applicant.*

AND

The management of Palana Colliery, Palana—*Opposite Party.*

In the matter of Reference IoDo No. 21 of 1958.

Dr. Jawahar Lal—*for the applicant.*

Shri M. G. Fell—*for the opposite party.*

AWARD

This is a petition under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The petitioner alleges, that he was a permanent workman of the Colliery, Pointsman by designation, that his job was changed into that of an Underground Trammer, that he was down-graded from Category No. VI to Category IV, and that due relief should be given to him.

3. The management plead, that there is no alteration in the conditions of service, that the petition, as brought is not maintainable, and that he is not entitled to any relief.

4. The issues, that arise for determination, are:—

(1) Whether the petition, as brought is maintainable?

(2) To what relief, if any, is the petitioner entitled?

Issues No. 1 and 2—

5. According to the case of the petitioner, he is a permanent workman of the Colliery, Pointsman by designation. He was however down-graded from Category No. VI to Category No. IV, and he is now treated as Underground Trammer. It is alleged, that this amounts to an unlawful alteration of the conditions of service to his prejudice. The management state, that previously the applicant was working as a Pointsman, but with effect from 14th June, 1958, the old pits were stopped, and there is no haulage in the present working pits. Accordingly, there is no job of Pointsman available to him. Therefore, he was asked to do the work of

Underground Trammer. It is made clear by the management, that the petitioner is getting the same wages as he was getting as a Pointsman in Category No. VI. It will be seen, that the workman has really suffered no prejudice. He is getting the same wages as before. Only there is change in designation, but this became inevitable because working of the old pits was discontinued from 14th June, 1958, and there was no job of Pointsman, available in the present working pits, as there was no haulage in them. Mr. Fell, the Mines Manager, has given the assurance that the petitioner will be continued to be paid the wages as for a workman in Category No. VI, in spite of the change in designation. In view of this assurance, there is no reason for the petitioner to feel aggrieved by the mere change in designation. As explained by the management, there was no need for a Pointsman from 14th June, 1958, because the work in the old pits was stopped. I find, that there has been no alteration in the conditions of service of the workman, and that he is not entitled to any relief in this proceeding, except to state, that he will be continued to be paid the wages due to him as for a workman in Category No. VI.

6. In the result, the petition is dismissed, except that it is made clear, that the workman shall be paid wages as for a workman in Category No. VI. No Order as to costs.

7. An award is passed accordingly.

(Two pages)

The 1st October, 1959.

E. KRISHNA MURTI,
Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Delhi.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, DELHI
PRESENT

Shri E. Krishna Murli, Central Government Industrial Tribunal.

1st October 1959

APPLICATION U/S 33A OF THE INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES ACT, 1947.

I.D. No. 224 OF 1959

Shri Taja Ram, S/o. Dana Ram, Onsetter, Palana Colliery, C/o. Palana Colliery Mazdoor Union, Administrative Office, Khazanchi Building, K.E.M. Road, Bikaner.—Applicant.

AND

The management of Palana Colliery, Palana—Opposite Party.
In the matter of Reference I.D. No. 81 of 1958.
Dr. Jawahar Lal—for the applicant.
Shri M. G. Fell—for the opposite party.

AWARD

This is a petition under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The petitioner alleges, that the opposite party has changed his conditions of service by changing his job into one of Surface Trammer from that of Onsetter, that he was down graded from Category V to Category IV, and that there has been a contravention of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

3. The contention on behalf of the management is, that there has been no contravention of Section 33, that at the time the reference was made to the Tribunal, the workman was only a Surface Trammer, that he is even now a Surface Trammer, that in the month of August, 1958 he was asked to work as an Onsetter at pit No. 2 for the purpose of sinking, that after the sinking was finished, his services were no longer required as Onsetter, and that he is not entitled to any relief.

4. The issues, that arise for determination, are:—

- (1) Whether the petition, as brought, is maintainable.
- (2) To what relief, if any, is the petitioner entitled?

Issues No. 1 and 2.

5. According to the case of the petitioner, he was a permanent workman of the Colliery, Onsetter, by designation, as per appointment letter issued by the Mines Manager on 28th August, 1958. He was however demoted to the post of

Surface Trammer, and was down graded from Category V to Category IV. It is, therefore, prayed, that he must be restored to his post of Onsetter, with wages payable for that post.

6. In my opinion, the contention on behalf of the workman is not tenable. It is clear, that he was only a Surface Trammer at the time of the reference. The conditions of service applicable to him at the time of reference are only those of a Surface Trammer. During the pendency of the proceedings under the reference, the petitioner was appointed as an Onsetter. Ext. W/1 is the letter of appointment dated 28th August, 1958. Ext. M/1 is the letter by the management, stating that the persons mentioned therein would work on and from 25th August, 1958 at No. 58/2 pit in the shifts shown against their names. The name of Shri Taja Ram, the present petitioner, is shown in the III shift. The contention on behalf of the management is, that Shri Taja Ram, the petitioner was, appointed only for the temporary purpose of sinking the pit, No. 2, that, after the sinking was finished, his services were no longer required as Onsetter, and therefore, he was put back in his old post of Surface Trammer. I fail to see how the workman was suffered, or how there has been any alteration of the conditions of service to his prejudice. The conditions of service applicable to him as a Surface Trammer at the time of reference, are even now applicable to him as Surface Trammer. Only he was asked to work as an Onsetter for the temporary work of sinking a pit, and as soon as the temporary work was finished, there was no place for him as Onsetter on the completion of the job. I find, that there has been no alteration of the conditions of service of the petitioner to his prejudice and that there is no contravention of Section 33. He is not entitled to any relief.

7. In the result, the petition is dismissed. No order as to costs.

8. An award is passed accordingly.

(Three pages)

The 1st October, 1959.

E. KRISHNA MURTI,

Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Delhi.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, DELHI

PRESENT

Shri E. Krishna Murti, Central Government Industrial Tribunal.

1st October 1959

APPLICATION U/S 33A OF THE INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES ACT, 1947.

I.D. No. 230 OF 1959

Shri Moti Ram, S/o. Nanda Ram, pointsman of Palana Colliery, C/o. Palana Colliery Mazdoor Union, Administrative Office, Khazanchi Building, K.E.M. Road, Bikaner.—Applicant.

AND

The management of Palana Colliery, Palana—Opposite Party.

In the matter of Reference I.D. No. 81 of 1958.

Dr. Jawahar Lal—for the applicant.

Shri M. G. Fell—for the opposite party.

AWARD

This is a petition under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The petitioner alleges, that he is a permanent workman of the Colliery, Pointsman by designation, that he was down graded to the post of Underground Trammer, and that he must be awarded suitable relief.

3. The contention on behalf of the management is, that there has been no change in the conditions of service, that there is no job of Pointsman in the present working pits, that the petitioner was asked to do the work of Underground Trammer, that there has been no change in the conditions of service or wages, and that the petitioner is not entitled to any relief.

4. The issues, that arise for determination, are:—

(1) Whether the petition, as brought, is maintainable?

(2) To what relief, if any, is the petitioner entitled?

Issues No. 1 and 2—

5. The petitioner is a permanent workman of the Colliery. According to his case, he was a Pointsman by designation, but he was demoted to the post of Underground Trammer, and he was down graded from Category No. VI to Category IV. His complaint is, that he must be restored to his old category and post.

6. It is admitted by the management in their counter, that previously the applicant was working as a Pointsman. However, with effect from 14th June, 1958 the old pits were stopped, and there is no haulage in the present working pits. As such there was no job of Pointsman available for the petitioner. Therefore, he was asked to do the work of Underground Trammer. It is however admitted, that he is getting the same wages as for a workman in Category No. VI, i.e., the same wages as he was getting previously as Pointsman. I fail to see how there has been any change in the conditions of service. Because there is no haulage in the present working pits, the petitioner has no place as a Pointsman. He continues to receive the same wages as before. Mr. Fell has given the assurance, that the petitioner will be paid the same wages as before, i.e., as for a Pointsman in Category No. VI. I find, that there has been no alteration in the conditions of service of the workman, except to state, that he will be continued to be paid the wages due to him as for a workman in Category No. VI.

7. In the result, the petition is dismissed, except, that it is made clear, that the workman shall be paid wages as for a workman in Category No. VI. No order as to costs.

8. An award is passed accordingly.
(Two pages)

The 1st October, 1959.

E. KRISHNA MURTI,

Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Delhi.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, DELHI
PRESENT

Shri E. Krishna Murti, Central Government Industrial Tribunal.

1st October 1959

APPLICATION U/S 33A OF THE INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES ACT, 1947.

I.D. No. 380 of 1959

Shri Shera Ram S/o. Lichhman Ram, Truck Driver, Palana Colliery, C/o. Palana Colliery Mazdoor Union, Administrative Office, Khazanchi Building, K.E.M. Road, Bikaner.—Applicant.

AND

The management of Palana Colliery, Palana.—Opposite Party.

In the matter of Reference I.D. No. 81 of 1958.

Dr. Jawahar Lal for the applicant.

Shri M. G. Fell—for the opposite party.

AWARD

This is a petition under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The petitioner has alleged, that he was a Truck Driver, that his services were terminated as from 10th March, 1959, without any reason, that such termination is illegal, that there has been alteration of the conditions of service to his prejudice and that this amounts to a contravention of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

3. The contention on behalf of the management is, that this petition is not maintainable, that there has been no alteration of the conditions of service, that the applicant was employed as a temporary Truck Driver for three months on 10th December 1958, that there is no contravention of Section 33, that this petition is not maintainable, and that the petitioner is not entitled to any relief.

4. The issues, that arise for determination, are:—

(1) Whether the petition, as brought, is maintainable?

(2) To what relief, if any, is the petitioner entitled?

Issues No. 1 and 2.

5. According to the case of the petitioner, Shri Sheraram he was working as a Truck Driver in the Colliery. His services were however unlawfully terminated, and for no reason, with effect from 10th March, 1959, by letter dated 28th February 1959. The contention on behalf of the petitioner is, that the termination of service is unlawful, and that he must be re-instated in his post, together with back wages.

6. The contention on behalf of the management is, that he was only a temporary Driver, that he was employed only for a temporary period, and that his services were not extended further. Ext. W/1 is a letter of appointment dated 10th December, 1958. It is expressly stated therein that Shri Shrearam was temporarily appointed as a Truck Driver for three months, commencing from 10th December, 1958. Ext. W/2 dated 28th February, 1959, is the communication sent to the petitioner, that his services would no longer be required on and from 10th March, 1959. Ext. W/3 is the certificate dated 28th February, 1954, that Shri Sheraram was prompt and careful in his duties. I am unable to hold, that there has been any alteration of the conditions of service to the prejudice of the petitioner. He was appointed expressly for a temporary period i.e., for a period of three months. He was informed, that his services were no longer required after the expiry of the temporary period. His was only a temporary appointment for a temporary period, and it is not open to him to contend, that the management did not have the right to decline to extend his services further. His services came automatically to an end on the expiry of the temporary period, for which he was appointed, when there was no extension of his appointment after the expiry of that period. On the contrary, he was expressly informed, that his services would not be extended any further. There has been no alteration of the conditions of service at all.

7. However, it has been pointed out on behalf of the workman, that the post, in which he was working, was not temporary, that it is still continuing, and that from 10th March, 1959, another person, Shri Khub Singh had been appointed in his place on and from 10th March, 1959. Exts. W/4 and 5 have been relied upon in this connection. Ext. W/5 shows, that Shri Khub Singh, Truck Driver, was not permitted to work on the Truck, and that he was reverted back to the post of Helper-cum-Driver from 5th December, 1958. The Mines Manager informed the Conciliation Officer in Ext. W/4, that Shri Khub Singh obtained his driving licence, and was again promoted as a Truck Driver on and from 10th March, 1959. It transpires from these documents, that Shri Khub Singh, who was not qualified to drive a truck, was prohibited from driving one with effect from 5th December, 1958. In his vacancy Shri Sheraram was appointed temporarily, and it was expressly made clear, that he was appointed only for a period of three months. After Shri Khub Singh obtained his driving licence, he was appointed back as Truck Driver. I fail to see, how the petitioner is entitled to complain against this action of the management. Shri Khub Singh was a senior employee and, as soon as he obtained his driving licence, to enable him to drive a truck, he was appointed as a Truck Driver. No exception can be taken to the action of the management. There has been no alteration of the conditions of service, applicable to the petitioner. The petition, as brought, is not maintainable. I find accordingly.

8. In the result, the petition is dismissed. No order as to costs.

9. An award is passed accordingly.

(Three pages)

1st October, 1959.

E. KRISHNA MURTI,
Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Delhi.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, DELHI
PRESENT

Shri E. Krishna Murli, Central Government Industrial Tribunal.

1st October 1959

APPLICATION U/S 33A OF THE INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES ACT, 1947.

I.D. No. 397 of 1959

Shri Peerdan, S/o. Hari Ram, C/o. Palana Colliery Mazdoor Union, Administrative Office, Khazanchi Building, K.E.M. Road, Bikaner—*Applicant*.

AND

The management of Palana Colliery, Palana—*Opposite Party*.

In the matter of Reference I.D. No. 81 of 1958.

Dr. Jawahar Lal—for the *applicant*.

Shri M. G. Fell—for the *opposite party*.

AWARD

This is a petition under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The petitioner alleges, that his service conditions have been altered, that he was one of the persons retrenched by the management on and from 14th June, 1958, that the petitioner has not been re-employed, even though others have been re-employed, in the post which he was looking after, and that he must be reinstated, together with back wages.

3. The contention on behalf of the management is, that there is no contravention of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, that denial of re-employment does not constitute a change in conditions of service, that there is no change in the conditions of service, that the applicant was temporarily employed as a clerk in the office, with effect from 7th April, 1958, that on 14th June, 1958 the applicant's services were terminated as the pits were closed down and as there was no work for him, that it has not been possible to re-employ the petitioner, as there is no vacancy for the job he was previously doing, and that he is not entitled to any relief.

4. The issues, that arise for determination, are:—

- (1) Whether the petition, as brought, is maintainable?
- (2) To what relief, if any, is the petitioner entitled?

Issues No. 1 and 2—

5. According to the petitioner's case, he was employed as a clerk in the Colliery, and his services were terminated by way of retrenchment with effect from 14th June, 1958. He was one of the retrenched workmen of the Colliery, included in the list of 109 workmen, who were retrenched on and from 14th June, 1958. The contention on behalf of the petitioner is, that he has not been re-employed, and that others have been re-employed in the post which he was occupying, contrary to Section 25 of the Industrial Disputes Act, and contrary to the rules on the subject. In my opinion, the contention on behalf of the petitioner is not well sustained. Admittedly, his services came to an end by way of retrenchment with effect from 14th June, 1958. As contended on behalf of the management, denial of employment to him does not amount to an alteration of the conditions of service within the meaning of Section 33. Apart from the above, it is well settled, that a person, whose services are terminated by way of retrenchment, cannot take advantage of the provisions of Section 33. The decision in National Industrial Works, Bombay (1958 II LLJ 518) is in point. It was held in that decision, that discharge by way of retrenchment does not come under clause (b), and that the proviso to that clause cannot apply to such discharge. I had occasion to deal with a similar question in the case of Hotel Imperial, Maidens Hotel, and Shama Magazine, reported in 1957, I.L.J. 123, and therein the conclusion was reached, that a person discharged by way of retrenchment was not entitled to resort to the aid of Section 33, and that Section 33(2)(b) did not apply to such a case. The present complaint, cannot be brought within the provisions of Section 33. There is no contravention of Section 33. The petition accordingly is not maintainable under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

6. In view of my finding, as above, that the petition, as brought, is not maintainable under Section 33A, it is unnecessary to go into the merits of the case. The evidence, that has been led on behalf of the workman does not need any consideration. I am not expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, and on the question, whether or not the petitioner is entitled to re-employment, as contended by him, and these matters, relating to the merits, are left open.

7. In the result, the petition is dismissed, as being not maintainable under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act. No order as to costs.

8. An award is passed accordingly.
(Three pages)

The 1st October, 1959.

E. KRISHNA MURTI,
Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Delhi.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, DELHI

PRESENT

Shri E. Krishna Murti, Central Government Industrial Tribunal.

1st October, 1959.

APPLICATION U/S 33A OF THE INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES ACT, 1947

I. D. No. 398 of 1959

Shri Dula Ram S/o Sawanta Ram, Underground Trammer, Palana Colliery
C/o Palana Colliery Mazdoor Union, Administrative Office, Khazanchi Building,
K. E. M. Road, Bikaner..... Applicant.

AND

The management of Palana Colliery, Palana.—*Opposite Party.*

In the matter of Reference I. D. No. 81 of 1958.

Dr. Jawahar Lal *for the applicant.*

Shri M. G. Fell *for the opposite party.*

AWARD

This is a petition under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The petitioner complains, that, on return from leave on 13th February, 1959, he was not allowed to resume duty till 20th February, 1959, excluding holidays, that this action of the management, is unlawful, and that he may be paid his wages from 13th to 20th.

3. The contention on behalf of the management is, that the workman is not entitled to the relief claimed, and that there is no contravention of Section 33.

4. The issues, that arise for determination, are:—

(1) Whether there is a contravention of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, and whether this petition, as brought, is maintainable?

(2) To what relief, if any, is the petitioner entitled.

Issues No. 1 and 2—

5. It is common ground, that the petitioner was on leave, and that he had to report himself for duty on return from leave on 13th February, 1959. It is alleged in Ext. W/1 dated 16th March, 1959, a communication, that was sent to the Mines Manager, that the petitioner, Shri Dula Ram, did report himself for duty on 13th February, 1959, on the third relay, that he went straight to the pit on that day, but he was, however, not allowed to proceed to his work. He went and approached the Mines Manager at about 11 p.m. on 13th at his bungalow, but he was asked to obtain a permit for permitting him to resume duty. An application was filed for a permit on 16th, and the permit was issued on the 18th, but reached the worker only on the 20th. The complaint of the workman is, that he was asked to obtain a permit for permitting him to resume duty. An application in spite of his having reported for duty on return from leave on the 13th.

6. The contention on behalf of the management is, that he was not entitled to resume duty on 13th February, 1959, without a written permit from the Mines Manager. It is alleged, that he put in application for a permit only on the 16th, that the permit was ordered to be issued on the 18th, that the workman did not report himself for duty even till the 20th, and that the workman himself is to be blamed in the matter, and that he is not entitled to any wages for the intervening period. I am unable to uphold the contention on behalf of the respondent. The office order, copy of which is Ext. W/2, shows, that workers underground or surface, who are sanctioned leave with or without pay, will be permitted to resume duty, without obtaining the sanction of the Mines Manager. The truth and genuineness of Ext. W/2 has been admitted by Mr. Fell, the Mines Manager, before me. This shows, that it was not at all necessary for the workman to obtain a previous permit to enable him to resume duty in the Mines. The management were not entitled to insist on the production of permit before resumption of duty. If the delay occurred in the workman resuming his duty, that was due to the unlawful insistence by the management on the production of the permit, which was not necessary in the face of Ext. W/2, the office order of the Mines Manager. The workman cannot be deprived of wages for the intervening period. There is unlawful alteration of the conditions of service of the workman by the management to his prejudice. The petition under Section 33 A of the Industrial Disputes Act is maintainable, as there is a contravention of Section 33. I find, that the petition as brought, is maintainable, and that the workman is entitled to recover the wages due to him from 13th to 20th February, 1959.

7. In the result, an award is passed, directing the management to pay the petitioner the wages due to him and withheld for the period between 13th and 20th February, 1959. No order as to costs.

(Three pages).

1st October, 1959.

E. KRISHNA MURTI,
Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Delhi.

BEFORE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL: DELHI.

PRESENT

Shri E. Krishna Murti, Central Government Industrial Tribunal.

1st October, 1959.

APPLICATION U/S 33A OF THE INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES ACT, 1947.

I. D. No. 413 of 1959.

Shri Gulab Rai S/o, Shri Dula Ram c/o Palana Colliery Mazdoor Union,
Administrative Office, Khazanchi Building, K. E. M. road, Bikaner.....
Applicant.

AND

The management of Palana Colliery, Palana.—*Opposite Party.*

In the Matter of Reference I. D. No. 81 of 1958.

Dr. Jawahar Lal for the applicant.

Shri M. G. Fell for the opposite party.

AWARD.

This is a petition under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The petitioner states, that the opposite party has victimised him, that there has been an alteration in the conditions of service, that he was a Surface Mate, that in his place Shri Lachha Ram, a daily rated Surface Trammer, was posted on and from 15th December, 1958, and that he must be restored to his old post, together with back wages.

3. The contention on behalf of the management is, that the petitioner, Shri Gulab Rai, was one of the workmen, who was retrenched on 14th June, 1958, as a result of the closure of the pits, that Shri Lachha Ram, who was a senior person, was retained in employment, that, after the pits were re-started, there was need for re-employment of some of the retrenched hands, that Shri Gulab Rai was offered the post of Surface Mazdoor, that he accepted the same, that, when, a

vacancy of Surface Mate arose, preference was given to Shri Lachha Ram, who was senior, that there is no change in the service conditions, that there is no contravention of Section 33, that the petition, as brought is not maintainable, and that the petitioner is not entitled to any relief.

4. The issues, that arise for determination, are:—

(1) Whether the petition, as brought, is maintainable?

(2) To what relief, if any, is the petitioner entitled?

Issues No. 1 and 2.

5. According to the case of the petitioner, he was a Surface Mate, and monthly rated. He was however not given the post of Surface Mate on and from 1st December, 1958. In his place one Shri Lachha Ram, a daily rated Surface Trimmer, was appointed on and from 15th December, 1958. It is thus contended, that the service conditions of the petitioner have been altered to his prejudice.

6. I am of opinion, that the petition, as brought is not maintainable, and that there is no contravention of Section 33. It is perfectly clear, that the petitioner is one of the persons retrenched with effect from 14th June, 1958, on account of the closure of certain pits. The petitioner now complains, that he was not re-employed in his old post. The contention on behalf of the management is, that Shri Lachha Ram, who was a senior person in this category, was retained in employment. When the pits were re-started, Shri Gulab Rai, one of the retrenched employees, was offered the job of Surface Mazdoor, which he accepted. I am satisfied, that there is no alteration of the conditions of service, on the facts of this case. The petitioner is really complaining, that he was not re-employed as a Surface Mate. Denial of re-employment, in the manner claimed, does not amount to alteration of the conditions of service. It is further important to note, that the petitioner is claiming re-employment, in his old post, which, he says, he was holding prior to retrenchment. It has been well settled, that retrenchment is not within the provisions of Section 33. In the decision in *National Industrial Works, Bombay* (1958 II LLJ 518), it was decided, that discharged by way of retrenchment does not come under clause (b), and that the proviso to that clause has no application to such discharge. Equally complaints against non-employment of retrenched personnel cannot be brought within the provisions of Section 33, and it cannot be held, that such denial of re-employment amounts to alteration of the conditions of service. I had occasion to deal with the question, whether retrenchment could be brought within the provisions of Section 33 in the decision relating to *Hotel Imperial, Maidens Hotel, and Shama Magazine* (1957 I.L.J. 123), and therein also the conclusion was reached, that a person discharged by way of retrenchment was not entitled to resort to the aid of Section 33, and that Section 33(2) (b) did not apply to such a case. The present complaint, that the workman has not been re-employed in his old post after retrenchment cannot be brought within the provisions of Section 33. There is no contravention of Section 33. The petition accordingly is not maintainable under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

7. In view of my finding, as above, that the petition, as brought, is not maintainable under Section 33A, it is unnecessary to go into the merits of the case. The evidence, that has been led on behalf of the workman, does not need any consideration. I am not expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, and on the question, whether or not the petitioner is entitled to re-employment as a Surface Mate. These matters, relating to the merits, are left open.

8. In the result, the petition is dismissed, as being not maintainable under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act. No order as to costs.

9. An award is passed accordingly.

(Three pages).

1st October, 1959.

E. KRISHNA MURTI,
Central Government Industrial Tribunal: Delhi.

[No. LRII-4(14)/59.]

New Delhi, the 23rd October 1959

S.O. 2421.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the North West Salanpur Colliery and their workmen.

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
DHANBAD.**

REFERENCE No 55 OF 1959.

PARTIES.

Employers in relation to the North West Salanpur Colliery.

AND

Their workmen.

Dhanbad, dated the 15th October, 1959.

PRESENT. Shri Salim M. Merchant, B A, L L B, Presiding Officer

APPEARANCES.

Shri F. C. Banerjee, Clerk, North West Salanpur Colliery—for the employers.

Shri S. Vir Raghav Acharier, Vice President, and Shri Dev Prasad Chatterjee, Secretary, West Bengal Khan Mazdoor Sangh—for the workmen

STATE: West Bengal.

INDUSTRY. Coal.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Employment, by Order No. LR/II/2(91)/59, dated 25th August, 1959, made in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947, (XIV of 47), was pleased to refer to me for adjudication the industrial dispute between the parties above named in respect of the matters specified in the following schedule to the said Order—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the refusal of the management to give work to Shri Dwijapado Gosh was justified, and if not to what relief is he entitled and from what date."

2 After the usual notice was issued on the parties and the employer company and filed its rejoinder dated 1/3 October, 1959, at the hearing of the dispute on 15th October, 1959, Shri Dev Prasad Chatterjee the Secretary of the West Bengal Khan Mazdoor Sangh filed an application along with the terms of settlement reached between the parties in which it is prayed that an award be made in terms of the settlement reached between the parties. Under the terms of settlement dated 13th October, 1959, the management has agreed that Shri Dewijapado Gosh will be reinstated with continuity of service with immediate effect and will be paid all his back wages from 7th April, 1959, at half the rate. As it appears to me that the terms of settlement are fair and reasonable, in the interest of industrial peace I make an award in terms thereof. A copy of the parties' application and memorandum of settlement is annexed hereto and marked Annexure 'A' and the same shall form part of this award

3 No order as to costs.

(Sd) SALIM M MERCHANT,
Presiding Officer, Central Government
Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad

DHANBAD,
15th October, 1959.

ANNEXURE "A"

**BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT'S INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL, DHANBAD.**

IN THE MATTER OF REFERENCE No. 55 OF 1959.

BETWEEN

Employer in relation to North West Salanpur Colliery.

AND

Their Workmen represented by West Bengal Khan Mazdoor Sangh, P. O. Hindusthan Cables, Dist. Burdwan.

Both the Parties above mentioned most respectfully sheweth:—

That both the Parties have reached to an agreement over the dispute referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. The Memorandum of settlement is enclosed herewith.

2. That both the Parties pray that the Tribunal may be gracious enough to give its award on the basis of the terms of settlement.

Employer.

Workman.

(Sd.) K. B. MUKHERJEE,
Managing Agent

(Sd.) DEV PR. CHATTERJEE,

Manager, North West Salanpur Colliery. Secretary, West Bengal Khan Bazdoor
P. O. Samdi, District Sangh, P.O. Hindusthan Cab., Dist.
Burdwan.

(Sd.) B. R. BATAOYAL, 13-10-59.
Manager, North West Salanpur Colliery.

Presented by me.

DEV PR. CHATTERJEE, 15-10-59.

Enclo. 1.

Taken on file.

Dated the 15th October, 1959.

(Sd.) SALIM M. MERCHANT,
Presiding Officer, Central Government
Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.

MEMORANDUM OF SETTLEMENT.

Names of parties—

Representing Employer—Manager, North West Salanpur Colliery.

Representing Workman—Secretary, West Bengal Khan Mazdoor Sangh.

Short recital of the case:—

A dispute arose out of the refusal of the Management of Messrs. North West Salanpur Colliery to give work to Shri. Dwija Pada Ghosh, a workman of the Colliery. The Union under the name of West Bengal Khan Mazdoor Sangh representing the workmen of the Colliery demanded re-instatement of Shri. Ghosh with all back wages. Two Joint discussions were held before The Conciliation Officer (Central), Asansol but with no effect. Thereafter, the dispute was referred to The Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Employment order No. F. LRII/2(91)/59, dated the 25th August, 1959.

Terms of Settlement:—

1. The Management agrees that Shri Dwija Pada Ghosh will be re-instated with continuity of service with immediate effect and he will be paid all his back wages from 7th April, 1959, at the half rate.

2. The Union i.e., West Bengal Khan Mazdoor Sangh agrees to jointly apply to The Presiding Officer, Central Government's Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad praying an award on the basis of the aforesaid term of settlement.

Witnesses.

1. B. D. SINGH, Dabor Colliery, P.O. Samdi, Burdwan.

2. B. D. CHAKRAVERTY, North West Salanpur Colliery,

P. O. Samdi, Burdwan.

K. B. MUKHERJEE, Managing Agent.

Signature of the Parties:—

1. B. R. BATAYAL, Manager,
North West Salanpur Colliery, P.O.
Samdi, Dist. Burdwan.

2. DEV PR. CHATTERJEE,
Secretary, West Bengal Khan
Mazdoor Sangh, P. O. Hindusthan
Cables, District Burdwan.

[No. LRII-2(91)/59.]

New Delhi, the 24th October 1959

S.O. 2422.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 4 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour & Employment No. S.O. 1715, dated the 24th July, 1959, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3(ii), dated the 23rd August, 1959, namely:—

Amendments

In the Table annexed to the said notification,—

(1) for the entries relating to serial numbers 17, 26, 56, 58, 62, 63 and 66, the following entries shall respectively be substituted, namely:—

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Designation of the Officer</i>	<i>Jurisdiction</i>
"17.	Labour Officer, Ranchi.	Ranchi District in the State of Bihar.
26.	Labour Officer, Karimnagar.	Adilabad and Karimnagar Districts in the State of Andhra Pradesh.
56.	District Labour Officer, Alleppey.	Alleppey District in the State of Kerala.
58.	District Labour Officer, Alwaye.	Ernakulam District in the State of Kerala.
62.	District Labour Officer, Quilon.	Quilon District in the State of Kerala.
63.	Deputy Labour Officer, Pathanamthitta.	Taluks of Pathanamthitta, Kunnathur and Pathanapuram in the State of Kerala.
66.	District Labour Officer, Trichur.	Trichur District in the State of Kerala", and

(2) after serial No. 101 and the entries relating thereto, the following entries shall be added, namely:—

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Designation of the Officer</i>	<i>Jurisdiction</i>
"102.	Deputy Labour Officer, Cochin.	Cochin Taluk in the State of Kerala.
103.	Deputy Labour Officer, Kalletta.	Taluks of South Wynaad and Ernad in the State of Kerala.
104.	Labour Officer, Palamau.	Palamau District in the State of Bihar.
105.	Labour Officer, Gaya.	Gaya District in the State of Bihar."

[No. LR II-55-1 (44)/57.]

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 22nd October 1959

S.O. 2423.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Central Bank of India Limited, Vijayawada and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri K. Ramaswamy Gounder, B.A., M.L., Retired High Court Judge, Madras, shall be the Presiding Officer with headquarters at the First Line Beach, Madras-1, and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Industrial Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

- (i) Whether the management of the Central Bank of India, Vijayawada group, are justified in asking the cashiers to appoint Cash Peons under their guarantee and to give letters of guarantee on behalf of messengers, chowkidars, godownkeepers, etc?
- (ii) Whether the securities (cash deposits and fidelity bonds) obtained by the Central Bank of India from its employees in the Vijayawada group are high and whether uniform securities should be taken by them? What should be the minimum security to be taken?

[No. LR-II-10(90)/59.]

S.O. 2424.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to Messrs Singho Mica Mining Co. Ltd., P. O. Tisri, District Hazaribagh and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7-A, of the said Act.

THE SCHEDULE

1. Whether Shri Amarendra Mukherjee, who was working as Magazine Clerk in the Pesham Division of the Mica Mining Co., Ltd., P. O. Tisri, was stopped from work by the management after 26th April, 1959 and whether the same was justified; if not, to what relief is he entitled?
2. Whether the management was justified in paying Rs. 1.28 nP. only per day to the workman considering the nature of his duties as Magazine Clerk from 25th August, 1958 onwards and, if not, what should be his rate of pay from that date?

[No. LR-II-20(21)/59.]

New Delhi, the 24th October 1959

S.O. 2425.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Bararee Jealgora Colliery and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the management was justified in terminating the services of Shri Golab Mia (E.B. No. 20049), Mining Sardar, Pit No. 7? If no, to what relief is he entitled?

[No. F. LR-II/2(18)59.]

S.O. 2426.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Sirka Colliery and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

1. Having regard to the duties performed by Shri S. P. Das, a clerk in the loading section, whether the management of Sirka Colliery was justified in placing him in clerical grade III under the award of the All India Industrial Tribunal (Colliery Disputes) as modified by the decision of the Labour Appellate Tribunal, and if not, to what relief is he entitled?
2. Whether the management of Sirka Colliery was justified in placing Sarvashri S. K. Chatterjee and Md. Mahabub, clerks in the Loading section of the Colliery, in clerical grade III under the award of the All India Industrial Tribunal (Colliery Disputes) as modified by the decision of the Labour Appellate Tribunal and if not, to what relief they are entitled?

[No. F. LR11-2(166)/59.]

PYARE LAL GUPTA, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 26th October 1959

S.O. 2427.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) the Central Government hereby appoints Shri L. I. Parija, I.A.S., Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Delhi, to be an Inspector for the whole of the Union territory of Delhi for the purposes of the said Act and of any Scheme framed thereunder, in relation to an establishment belonging to, or under the control of the Central Government, or in relation to an establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oil-field or a controlled industry, *vice* Shri K. B. Saxena.

[No. PF-I/31(651)/59.]

S.O. 2428.—In pursuance of the provisions of paragraph 20 of the Employees' Provident Funds Scheme, 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri L. I. Parija, I.A.S. as Regional Provident Fund Commissioner for the whole of the Union Territory of Delhi, *vice* Shri K. B. Saxena. Shri Parija shall work under the general control and superintendence of the Central Provident Fund Commissioner.

[No. PF-I/31(651)/59.]

P. D. GAIHA, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

New Delhi, the 22nd October 1959

S.O. 2429.—It is notified for general information that Shri P. N. Chamu Nair having tendered resignation of the membership of the Madras Advisory Panel of the Central Board of Film Censors, the Central Government has accepted the same with effect from 9th September, 1959.

[No. F.11/4/59-FC.]

D. R. KHANNA, Under Secy.